The Communist

20c JANUARY 1942

Copy B

LENIN AND THE GLOBE WAR
ROBERT MINOR

•

BROWDER ON THE UNION OF NATIONS

•

TRADE UNIONS IN THE WAR EMERGENCY
WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

•

WHAT WE CAN LEARN FROM THE SOVIET PEOPLE
ISRAEL AMTER

•

IN THE NAME OF THE ITALIAN PEOPLE
M. ERCOLI

•

"THE SOVIETS EXPECTED IT" BY ANNA LOUISE STRONG
REVIEWED BY OAKLEY JOHNSON

FOR EVIDENTIARY PURPOSES.
THIS PUBLICATION MUST NOT BE
MARKED IN ANY MANNER EXCEPT
WHERE FILE NUMBERS ARE.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SELECTED WORKS OF V. I. LENIN

This series includes the most important and popular of Lenin's writings, arranged both chronologically and topically. Complete in twelve volumes. Each volume $2.00.

I. Prerequisites of the First Russian Revolution (1894-1899)
The economic and social background of the Revolution of 1905.

II. The Struggle for the Bolshevik Party (1900-1904)
The period of the ideological crystallization of Bolshevism.

III. The Revolution of 1905-1907
The character, forces and prospects of the first Russian Revolution.

IV. The Years of Reaction and the New Revival (1908-1914)
The period of reaction after defeat, and the revival beginning in 1912.

V. Imperialism and Imperialist War (1914-1917)
Background and causes of the war.

VI. From the Bourgeois to the Proletarian Revolution (1917)
The course of the Russian Revolution from February to October.

VII. After the Seizure of Power (1918)
Fundamental tasks after the seizure of power.

VIII. The Period of War Communism (1918-1920)
Problems during the civil war and foreign intervention.

IX. New Economic Policy (1921-1923)
Contains most of the last words of Lenin.

X. The Communist International
Writings and speeches on the Third International.

XI. The Theoretical Principles of Marxism
On dialectical and historical materialism.

XII. Theory of the Agrarian Question
Writings on capitalism in agriculture.

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XXI, No. 1 JANUARY, 1942

THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM

EDITOR: EARL BROWDER

CONTENTS

Lenin and the Globe War	*Robert Minor*	3
Should the United States Government Join in Concerted Action Against the Fascist States?	*Earl Browder*	22
The Nation and the War	*Robert Minor*	38
Trade Unions in the War Emergency	*William Z. Foster*	57
What We Can Learn From the Soviet People	*Israel Amter*	71
In the Name of the Italian People	*M. Ercoli*	81
Book Review		92
The Thirty-First Anniversary of *New Masses*		95

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. THE COMMUNIST is published monthly by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York City, to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW AND FORTHCOMING PAMPHLETS ON THE WAR

Labor and the War, by William Z. Foster	**$.02**
The War and the Negro People, by James W. Ford	**.02**
Retreat from Moscow: The Napoleonic War of 1812, by E. Tarle	**.10**
Earl Browder—The Man from Kansas, by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn	**.02**
The Slavic Peoples Against Hitler	**.05**
Soviet Women to the Women of the World	**.05**
Earl Browder on the Soviet Union	**.05**
Defend America by Smashing Hitlerism, by Wiliam Z. Foster	**.01**
America Must Act Now, by Gil Green	**.01**
The Browder Case	**.02**
America Speaks for Earl Browder	**.05**
The Negro and Justice: A Plea for Earl Browder, by Dr. M. Yergan and Paul Robeson	**.02**

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LENIN AND THE GLOBE WAR

BY ROBERT MINOR

"Any phenomenon can be understood and explained. . . ."

* * *

ON THIS anniversary of Lenin's death we undertake no general appraisal; that task has been performed far better than we could do it.*

Today we speak only of Lenin's life and work in a few selected aspects that can most vividly and usefully be called to mind in the present situation.

The present situation is one dominated by a great, universal war—a war to which current historians are seeking to attach the title of "The Globe War" in order to make a needed distinction from the World War of 1914-18.

I

Lenin's name is the only one among the names of heads of states of the World War and post-World War period that a historian a hundred years from now could not omit from his chronicle without effacing history. The statecraft of Lenin is the only statecraft of the World War period of which there remains a single stone upon another stone today. There was no other statesman of that period of whom we could say: "If he had lived he would have seen his house stand."

If Lenin had lived until today, which would give him but a little more than the "threescore years and ten" that are "the days of our years," his time would have spanned the two World Wars; and in the spanning of the second of the two great wars the genius of Lenin would have appeared no less that of a master of history than it was in the first. In fact, the capacities of Lenin are in a very practical sense extended into this second of the two great wars. We mean that the house that he built does stand; and we mean that he built both of concrete and steel, and of men; he built a state that could not be destroyed, and in his country he built a party that could not be destroyed. Lenin left disciples; the compelling historical forces that expressed themselves through Lenin have continued to find a Lenin.

Lenin left a Stalin.

* * *

Never before did a man live who "made history" to the degree that Lenin did. To a degree greater than

* Best of all by Stalin, by whom "the appraisal" is written not alone in books but also on the snows of Western Russia.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was ever true of any other man, the events of this century were taken into the hands of Lenin.

Plekhanov, in his work *The Role of the Individual in History*, took exception to a saying of Bismarck that "we cannot make history and must wait while it is being made." Plekhanov said:

". . . No great man can foist on society relations which *no longer* conform to the state of these forces, or which *do not yet* conform to them. In this sense, indeed, he cannot make history, and in this sense he would advance the hands of his clock in vain; he would not hasten the passage of time nor turn it back. . . .

". . . But if I know in what direction social relations are changing owing to given changes in the social-economic process of production, I also know in what direction social mentality is changing; consequently, I am able to influence it. Influencing social mentality means influencing historical events. Hence, in a certain sense, I *can make history*, and there is no need for me to wait while 'it is being made.'" *

Lenin made history and did not wait while it was "being made." All other statesmen of the World War tried to make history. Over their heads it was made. How was it made? In what consisted the art of Lenin and of Stalin?

Of the early beginnings of Lenin's leadership, Stalin found the cause in—

". . . His extraordinarily profound knowledge of Marx, his ability to apply Marxism to the economic and political situation of Russia at that time, his ardent and unshakable belief in the victory of the workers' cause, and his outstanding talent as an organizer. . . ." *

and it was Lenin who guided "the first body in Russia that began to *unite socialism with the working class movement*."**

That was the beginning of the unprecedented political party that Lenin proved capable of building, where no other could. Let the reader understand this at the beginning: that Lenin's life and all its significance were expressed through the Bolshevik Party he built. Without building it Lenin could not have been Lenin. Because he worked that way, we now see Lenin in the flash of mighty cannon, and history is made on a world scale for all mankind.

Lenin wrote:

"In its struggle for power the proletariat has no other weapon but organization. Divided by the rule of anarchic competition in the bourgeois world, ground down by slave labor for capital, constantly thrust back to the 'lower depths' of utter destitution, savagery and degeneration, the proletariat can become, and will inevitably become, an invincible force only when its ideological unity round the principles of Marxism is consolidated by the material unity of an organization, which unites millions of toilers in the army of the working class." ***

Stalin, whose life is so inseparably interwoven with that of Lenin and

* G. Plekhanov, *The Role of the Individual in History*, International Publishers, pp. 60-61.

* *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, International Publishers, p. 16.

** *Ibid.*, p. 17.

*** Lenin, *Selected Works*, International Publishers, Vol. II, p. 466.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whose work is so unbreakably the continuation of the *political* life of Lenin that no complete consecutive history of either can be given without that of the other, wrote this explanation of the vitality of the Bolshevik Party:

"The strength and vitality of Marxism-Leninism are derived from the fact that it relies upon an advanced theory which correctly reflects the needs of development of the material life of society, that it elevates theory to a proper level, and that it deems it its duty to utilize every ounce of the mobilizing, organizing and transforming power of this theory.

"That is the answer historical materialism gives to the question of the relation between social being and social consciousness, between the conditions of development of material life and the development of the spiritual life of society." *

Lenin himself gave the "focus" of his work:

"If one were to attempt to define by a single word the focus, so to speak, of the whole correspondence [of Marx and Engels], the central point in which the whole body of ideas expressed and discussed converges—that word would be dialectics. The thing that interested Marx and Engels most of all, the thing to which they contributed what was most essential and new, the thing that constituted the masterly advance they made in the history of revolutionary thought, was the application of materialist dialectics to the reshaping of all political economy, from its foundations up—to history, natural science, philosophy and to the policy and tactics of the working class." *

II

In bourgeois society it is not admitted—at least not fully and with all its consequences—that modern science can explain or perform any useful service of analysis and prognosis in the field of social phenomena and historical movement. But the laws of motion of history are *scientific* laws; and the Marxists-Leninists have been able to channelize the floods of history only because, and to the degree that, they have mastered these scientific laws, which are dialectical and materialistic.

"Dialectical materialism is the world-outlook of the Marxist-Leninist party. . . .

"Historical materialism is the extension of the principles of dialectical materialism to the study of social life, an application of the principles of dialectical materialism to the phenomena of the life of society, to the study of society and its history."**

One can pretend that no such laws apply in the study of society and history; but these laws apply nevertheless; these laws are *necessity;* and any inhibition of recognition of necessity—any blindness to these laws—enslaves men to them as "blind laws." Knowledge of these laws brings freedom to "make history," and the movement founded by Marx and Engels a century ago brought down from the sun the light by which we see that—

* *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, p. 117.

* Lenin: *Selected Works*, Vol. XI, p. 44.
** *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, p. 105.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

". . . the products of the human brain, being in the last analysis also products of nature, do not contradict the rest of nature but are in correspondence with it."*

The Marxists-Leninists asserted the capacity of the human intellect to know the "unknown" social forces, which bourgeois "sociology" declares can never be known, and "modern materialism and modern scientific socialism" became "the theory and practical program of the labor movement in all civilized countries of the world." **

To show the stark application of scientific method where it had never been applied before, Lenin quoted Marx, who said:

" '[From] my viewpoint . . . the evolution of the economic formation of society is viewed as a process of natural history.'

". . . this is precisely the basic idea of *Capital* and . . . it is pursued . . . with strict consistency and with rare logical force."***

And frequently Lenin spoke of:

". . . Marx's basic idea that the development of the economic formation of society is a process of natural history. . . ."****

As we look at the present cycle of war from the invasion of China in 1931, the invasion of Ethiopia in 1934, of Spain in 1936, when we remember the formation of the German-Italian-Japanese war alliance against the United States and Great Britain—a pact that was made in September, 1935, under the Gilbert and Sullivan title of "Anti-Comintern Pact"—and when we look upon bomb-scarred London and recall the fantastic return of Neville Chamberlain from Munich in September, 1938, with "peace in our time," and when we see today a goodly portion of the scrap-iron and scrap-manpower of the "New Order of Europe" lying dead in the snow under the moving feet of Soviet soldiers—we cannot but have an impression that on the one hand there is an enslavement of men to futility; on the other hand a *freedom to deal with and to master historical forces.*

Freedom to master historical forces?

Whence comes this freedom of the one—the Lenin-Stalin freedom? And whence the opposite—the enslavement to the "blind forces" of history?

The Marxists, the Leninists, are the Prometheus who captured from the sun the fire, the light, that gives this freedom. Not from heaven by prayers, but from the sun by spectroscope, let us say. The freedom of a state founded by Lenin and Stalin, manifested now in the movements of once-"annihilated" troops all the way from Petsamo to the Crimea, a freedom that is manifested in the power that drops from the skies into the German lines blank permits for German troops to find refuge in the Soviet lines—this freedom is acquired through knowledge of and capacity to conform to, to understand, therefore to conquer and utilize "the science of the general laws of motion" of history. Lenin, in stating the essence of this

* Engels, *Anti-Dühring,* International Publishers, pp. 42-43.
** Lenin, *Selected Works,* Vol. XI, p. 44.
*** *Ibid.,* p. 416.
**** *Ibid.,* p. 417.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

science, quoted Engels' *Anti-Dühring:*

". . . Freedom is the appreciation of necessity. Necessity is blind only insofar as it is not understood."*

Lenin added that:

"This means the recognition of objective law in nature and of the dialectical transformation of necessity into freedom (in the same manner as the transformation of the unknown, but knowable, 'thing-in-itself' into the 'thing-for-us,' of the 'essence of things' into 'phenomena')."**

Against the debasers and falsifiers of the world outlook of Marxism, Lenin frequently quoted Engels to say:

"Hegel was the first to state correctly the relation between freedom and necessity. To him, freedom is the appreciation of necessity. 'Necessity is *blind* only *in so far as it is not understood.*' Freedom does not consist in the dream of independence of natural laws, but in the knowledge of these laws, and in the possibility this gives of systematically making them work toward definite ends. This holds good in relation both to the laws of external nature and to those which govern the bodily and mental existence of men themselves—two classes of laws which we can separate from each other at most only in thought but not in reality. Freedom of the will therefore means nothing but the capacity to make decisions with real knowledge of the subject. Therefore the *freer* a man's judgment is in relation to a definite question, with so much the greater *necessity* is the content of this judgment determined. . . . Freedom therefore consists in the control over ourselves and over external nature which is founded on knowledge of natural necessity." *

To this Lenin added:

". . . for Engels all living human practice permeates the theory of knowledge itself and provides an *objective* criterion of truth. For until we know a law of nature, it, existing and acting independently and outside our mind, makes us slaves of 'blind necessity.' But once we come to know this law, which acts (as Marx pointed out a thousand times) *independently* of our will and our mind, we become the lords of nature. The mastery of nature manifested in human practice is a result of an objectively correct reflection within the human head of the phenomena and processes of nature, and is proof of the fact that this reflection (within the limits of what is revealed by practice) is objective, absolute and eternal truth."**

III

Why did the product of Lenin's architecture stand where all the other structures put up in the World War and post-World War period fell? We will not discuss the manifold reasons why it stood, but will only suggest the single but profoundly decisive matter of Lenin's method of meeting the question of war. Lenin's method was applied, and by its very essence could only be applied, in the theater of reality. The theater of history in which the Leninist method received its first

* Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, p. 125.
** Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. XI, p. 15.

* Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, p. 125.
** Lenin, *Selected Worker*, Vol. XI, p. 250.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and most decisive validation was the first World War. Lenin's method by its essence approaches all questions of war concretely, never as abstract problems and never with a so-called "principle" or dogma of opposition to all war "in general." Since war is "the continuation of politics by other *(i.e.)*, forceful means," one does not leave off the struggle at the moment where it is continued by military methods. Lenin and all true Marxists saw the First World War, not only at the moment of its outbreak but in advance during the full quarter of a century of its preparation, as a war that could only be *reactionary on both sides*. Lenin made the tremendous contribution in his book *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism,* which became a new cornerstone of the science of the general laws of motion of society. Lenin's monumental work exposed the full meaning of imperialism and imperialist war in the light of the great turn in history, in the decisive ascendancy of monopoly capital that took place at the turn of the century. But even prior to this monumental work, the science of Marxism at the command of the labor movement had been able to see something of the nature of the coming First World War.

As far back as 1887 Engels said:

"And finally no war is any longer possible for Prussia-Germany except a world war, and a world war indeed of an extension and violence hitherto undreamt of. Eight to ten millions of soldiers will mutually massacre one another and in doing so devour the whole of Europe until they have stripped it barer than any swarm of locusts has ever done. . . . Devastation . . . famine, pestilence, general demoralization both of the armies and of the mass of the people produced by acute distress; hopeless confusion of our artificial machinery of trade. . . ."*

Engels then, just forty years in advance of the event, spoke of the inevitability of that war's resulting in such phenomena as the Russian October Revolution of 1917. So well grounded in scientific theory was this view that it was the orthodoxy of the workers' movement of the world. The Second International in its Congress at Brussels in 1891 repeated the idea of Engels with the words:

"In the next war millions of persons will be called to the colors, whole nations will be hurled against each other. A war will break out the like of which is unknown to world history and in comparison with which the last Franco-Prussian War was mere child's play." **

In all succeeding Congresses of the International the theme was repeated in mounting scale, up to the Basle Congress in 1912, two years before the World War, of whose resolution on war Lenin said:

" . . . this resolution is the most exact and complete, the most solemn and formal exposition of socialist views on war and on tactics in relation to war." ***

But Lenin took the precaution to emphasize that the Basle resolution —correct though it was for the specific type of war that was foreseen truly as the type of the First World

* *Ibid.*, Vol. VIII, p. 399.
** *Ibid.*, Vol. VIII, p. 398.
*** *Ibid.*, Vol. V., pp. 168-69.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

War—was *not applied to all wars,* and not to war "in general." The Basle resolution called for a struggle against both sides of *the war that then lay ahead,* a war that was reactionary and could only be reactionary on both sides.

Lenin later said, speaking in March, 1918—

"The Basle resolution does not speak of a national war, of a people's war, examples of which have occurred in Europe, wars that were even typical of the period of 1789-1871; it does not speak of a revolutionary war, which the Social-Democrats never renounced, but of the *present* war, which is the outcome of 'capitalist imperialism' and 'dynastic interests,' the outcome of 'the policy of conquest' pursued by *both* groups of belligerent nations, the Austro-German and the Anglo-Franco-Russian groups. . . ." *

No one will understand Lenin's method unless he understands the distinction that Lenin makes here between a "national war, . . . a people's war," and also "a revolutionary war, which the Socialists never renounced," on the one hand, and, on the other hand, "the *present* war [1914-18] which is the outcome of 'capitalist imperialism' and 'dynastic interests,' the outcome of 'the policy of conquest' pursued by both groups of belligerent nations. . . ."

* * *

This distinction becomes supremely important and absolutely decisive for any serious attempt to apply Lenin's method to the great military struggle in which the whole world is locked at the beginning of this year 1942. Speaking on March 8, 1918, Lenin described the character of the period in part as follows:

"And this violence will cover a historical period, a whole era of wars of the most varied kinds—imperialist wars, civil wars within the country, the interweaving of the former with the latter, national wars, the emancipation of the nationalities crushed by the imperialists and by various combinations of imperialist powers which will inevitably form various alliances with each other in the era of vast state-capitalist and military trusts and syndicates. This is an era of tremendous collapses, of wholesale military decisions of a violent nature, of crises." *

Lenin's method was able to discern not only the character of the war then at hand, but also the conditions under which a war of a different kind might be produced by history. Lenin saw that in the World War of 1914-18 "progress, if we leave out the possibility of temporary steps backward, [was] possible only toward *socialist society,* only toward the *socialist revolution.*" And because the Leninist method was able to make this its guide to action, Lenin's work was crowned with monumental success. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was founded. Lenin's architecture stands.

* * *

Where is the structure that was built by the other World War statesmen? Not a League of Nations but a "league of imperialists to strangle the nations" was built.

* *Ibid.,* Vol. V, p. 171.

* *Ibid.,* Vol. VIII, pp. 315-16.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An unprecedentedly powerful aggregation of victorious states—war-mad and drunk with victory—was formed in the vast structure of Versailles. This organization had no purpose in cooperation with the progressive forces of history, but on the contrary confirmed the foresight by which Lenin saw that the war was imperialist and reactionary on *both* sides. Against the newest and most progressive democratic force in the world, the new socialist state, the architects of the Versailles structure presented the *cordon sanitaire*.

But the "general laws of motion of society" shook down the huge structure of Versailles. Not a stone of it remains upon another stone. And why? Because it was built in defiance of the general laws of motion of society. Evolution is a process of development "upward and onward," from the lower to the higher —its process moves *toward* democracy and the development of higher forms of democracy and only through democracy and the higher forms of democracy does it move, in the last analysis, beyond democracy; and then not the *demos*, but the *krateo* is negated.

* * *

It was within the scope of the scientific method of Lenin not alone to see the nature of the war of 1914-18, toward which the decisive forces of history had been moving for several decades, but it was also possible and inevitable by the same scientific method to see that the end of that war might quite conceivably bring about such a situation in Europe and the world as would make inevitable a second huge war on a world scale which, Lenin said, might, under certain eventualities which he named, be a war of a quite different character from that of 1914-18. Lenin said that if the war of 1914 were to result in such a way that

". . . the European proletariat were to remain impotent for another 20 years; if the present war [1914-18] were to end in victories sooner to those achieved by Napoleon, in the subjugation of a number of virile national states; if imperialism outside of Europe (primarily American and Japanese) were to remain in power for another 20 years. . . ."

—then a great national war in Europe would be possible.*

Lenin continued:

"This means that Europe would be thrown back for several decades. This is improbable. But it is *not* impossible, for to picture world history as advancing smoothly and steadily without sometimes taking gigantic strides backward is undialectical, unscientific and theoretically wrong." *

Lenin took pains to see that his estimate could not be passed over as a chance remark or a purely incidental or unimportant reservation. He carefully stated it as a proven scientific fact; "For," he said, "to picture world history as advancing smoothly and steadily without sometimes taking gigantic strides backward is undialectical, unscientific and theoretically wrong." Nor did Lenin refer to it only once. On another occasion during the World War he said:

* Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XIX, "The Pamphlet by Junius," 1922.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"We are dealing here with large historic epochs; there are and there will be in every age individual, partial, backward and forward movements. . . ." *

All of the conditions that were foreseen by Lenin as making for possibility of a "temporary retrogression," a "gigantic stride backward," came to fulfillment.

* * *

In the period of economic collapse in Central Europe in the early 1930's the *cordon sanitaire* that had been built by those ghosts of past history, headed by Clemenceau, fell into decay. From the Arctic Ocean to the Black Sea there were no longer any peoples easily to be made into cannon fodder for the war plans of the reaction in western Europe.

A fantastic rat-man found his way from the leaking sewers of Europe. First developed among the ranks of strike-breakers in the building trades of Vienna, becoming later, in Munich, a routine employee of the German military espionage service, trained as a professional *agent provocateur* and as such planted, as were many others of his type, into the various mushroom sects and groupings of workers in disillusioned Germany, this little rat-man, Hitler, happened to be the one propelled by the bursting sewage of rotting reaction to the surface—and the top surface—of German political life. For several years, from the 1920's up to 1933, the policy of the German Weimar Republic wavered between that of becoming stronger through favorable relations with the Soviet Union and that of hiring itself out as the armed force of old Clemenceau's *cordon sanitaire*. The coming to the surface of the rodent Hitler as the head of the German state in January, 1933, constituted the success of a policy that appeared to make Germany a servant of British and French reaction, but which made Germany in fact a Frankenstein that would crush France and all of continental Europe and would inevitably seek to crush Great Britain and the United States as well. The rat-man of Vienna, the strike-breaker of the building trades, the *agent provocateur* who organized in the pay of Ludendorff the "German National Socialist Workers Party," was brought forward by the forces of reaction as the "leader" charged with the duty of turning the course of history backward.

But it is not "onward and upward," but backward and downward, not "from the lower to the higher," but from the higher to the lower, that German fascism would lead. It is therefore not by science but by "intuition" that the German state must be led. Mystic tales are told of the rat-man in solitude receiving messages from a rodent "infinite." The rat-man "retires to meditate," and the most powerful mechanism of war of which man has ever dreamed—based upon the stolen equipment and economic resources of seventeen nations and all of continental Europe—is commanded by the "intuition" of one little former undercover stool-pigeon of a Munich detective service: a "Chowderhead Cohen" in charge of the armies of Europe.

* *Ibid.*, Vol. XVIII, p. 125.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Stalin said:

". . . in order not to err in policy one must look forward, not backward." *

And to black out democracy — and by this we mean bourgeois democracy *and* socialist democracy— one must not look *forward* but *backward*.

It is Leninism when Stalin says:

"Actually the Hitler regime is a counterpart of the reactionary regime which existed in Russia under tsarism. . . . The Hitler party is a party of . . . medieval reaction and blackguard pogroms . . . the program and directives of people who have lost every vestige of human beings and are degraded to the level of wild beasts. And these people, deprived of conscience and honor, people with the morals of beasts, have the audacity to call for the annihilation of the great Russian nation, the nation of Plekhanov and Lenin, Belinsky and Chernyshevsky, Pushkin and Tolstoy, Glinka and Tchaikovsky, Gorky and Chekhov, Sechenov and Pavlov, Repin and Surikov, Suvorov and Lutuzov! . . .

"The route of the German imperialist and their armies is inevitable." **

The little rat-man must replace the science that points to a social "onward and upward movement . . . from the lower to the higher" with a pseudo-science of the past; the "racial" theory is resurrected from the Dark Ages. A reaction—*i.e.*, a turning back to the obsolete ideological rubbish of a thousand years ago—becomes necessary. Germany and all the human race must *return, i.e.*, revert, turn backward to "good old German" paganism. But the once "good old" German paganism, like all things of antiquity, is dead. It cannot live again. The theory must be advanced that one *can* return to the past—that history merely moves in a circle, that it repeats itself, that what has been can be again. But the process of evolution, of development is not "movement in a circle, not . . . a simple repetition of what has already occurred but . . . an onward and upward movement, . . . a transition from an old qualitative state to a new qualitative state, . . . a development from the simple to the complex, from the lower to the higher." *

Do the books say this?—and none so well as the books of classic German philosophy—fructified by the work of Marx and Lenin.

The rat-man burned all the books that said that there could be an "extension of the principles of the dialectical method to the study of social life." **

But the ashes of books cannot turn history backward; what the millions of young Germans could not read in the burned books they are now reading in the blows of the Red Army across the frozen steppes, that there are

" . . . a past and a future, something dying away and something developing; and that the struggle between these opposites, the struggle between the old and the new, between

* *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, p. 111.
** *Stalin Speaks to the World*, Workers Library Publishers, pp. 10-11.

* *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, p. 107.
** *Ibid.*, p. 109.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that which is dying away and that which is being born, between that which is disappearing and that which is developing, constitutes the internal content of the process of development, the internal content of the transformation of quantitative changes into qualitative changes." *

"Nature," says Engels, "is the test of dialectics"—and so is the snow on the road to Smolensk.

* * *

From the moment of the rise of the Hitler reaction to power, the world's progressive forces, represented subjectively and objectively by the newest and most advanced democratic state, strove for a coalition of all people against the Hitler imperialism that menaced the national existence of all.

The great powers of Western Europe were too deeply penetrated and influenced by the same reaction to be capable of such coalition and of collective defense of their national existence. The great West-European states fed the rat-man even while he gnawed out their foundations—from the time of the Ethiopian and Spanish conquests to the time of Munich when the *reactionary* coalition of these great states with Hitler seemed to have been irrevocably consummated, and through the Polish crisis of August, 1939; even after declaring war the Chamberlain-Daladier governments tried, by withholding military action in defense of their countries, to repair the monstrous coalition of the states of Western civilization with the German fascist reaction that was destroying all.

The reactionary forces made their mistake: the rat-man attacked the Lenin state. Up to the very dawn of June 22, reactionary spokesmen in England and America conceived of a possible attack on the Soviet Union as a deflection of the blow from their own countries; but on the dawn of June 23 it became clear that the rat-man's war, leaping the bounds of Europe, could now only be a war against all nations of the world and most particularly the United States. The rat-man had pulled down upon himself the great national war of Europe. The coalition of democratic states that might have been made in 1935-36 became reality in 1941. The second imperialist war was transformed into its opposite. The great war of liberation of all nations against national enslavement, foreseen hypothetically by Lenin a quarter of a century before, became reality.

* * *

The Bolsheviks use books.

The selected writings of Engels on military subjects are published by the War Department of the Soviet Union in two volumes and used in the training of officers. "War is the continuation of politics by other (*i.e.*, forceful) means," and the great teachers of politics are the teachers of the Red Army soldiers. The direct and literal application of their method to problems of military struggle is suggested by the words of Marx:

"Is there anywhere where our theory that the *organization of labor is determined by the means of production* is more brilliantly con-

* *Ibid.*, p. 109.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

firmed than in the human slaughter industry?"*

As a necessity for the survival of the Soviet democracy, Lenin's and Stalin's and the Soviet workers' state long ago saw to it that the great basic industries should thrive in the socialist land and that there should be no neglect of "the means of production in the human slaughter industry."

But when, through the looting of the arsenals of seventeen European nations, Hitler was able to arm the "gigantic stride backward" with a superiority in numbers, "several times" as many tanks, and a superior number of airplanes—the heirs of Lenin knew how to transform this necessity into freedom, *i.e.*, into the retention of the power of initiative of the Red Army. Necessity, recognized, was transformed into the freedom to inflict heavy destructive injury to the enemy; the Red Army knew how to retreat, and the freedom of initiative remained.

Fatalism? No. It is not "fate" but sons of trade unionists and collective farmers that are bayonetting Nazis on the snow.

* * *

The world is about to learn now that the German army cannot retreat.

The Soviet army could retreat, could win a colossal military struggle under conditions necessitating retreat, because of its cultural background; its morale based on the consciousness of all its soldiers that they and their cause represent the forward movement of history.

The German army, on the contrary, represents a temporary backward movement of history, and consciousness of this lies underneath the shell of Nazi degeneracy. The morale of the German army has attained a certain effective level, but it is not and cannot be based on the courage to face the give and take of defeats. The morale of the German army is no more than a spell cast upon the mass by the myth of invincibility. When Cortez entered Mexico with a handful of armored cavalrymen, his fate depended upon the myth that the steel armor was the natural hide of soldiers that were gods; that horse and rider constituted one godly body; when any men or horses were killed in battle, the Spanish commander was obliged to prevent discovery of bodies of men or horses killed in battle.

The German Nazi commanders have a more difficult task: to preserve in their own soldiers the myth that they cannot be conquered. It is the gangster-morale, the superstition that they can only win. When once this myth is broken the German soldier sees through the blizzard that the Red Army represents history, a state of "continuous movement, and change, of continuous removal and development, where something is always rising and developing"; and he looks back westward to see that all the mighty force of Hitler represent the eternal accompaniment — "something always disintegrating and dying away."

* * *

But the legions of Hitler cannot

* Marx to Engels Letter, July 7, 1866, *Karl Marx, Selected Works,* International Publishers, Vol. I, p. 379.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

retreat without revealing to the minds of the German soldiers that the future of the world is pushing them back, that the forward-moving forces of history are not—as Hitler and Lindbergh had to say—"weak and inefficient" and therefore hopeless.

In 1916, in discussion of the slogan of a "United States of Europe," while rejecting that slogan, Lenin said:

"In comparison with the United States of America, Europe as a whole implies economic stagnation. On the present economic basis, *i.e.*, under capitalism, the United States of Europe would mean the organization of reaction to retard the more rapid development of America." *

Today when the so-called "New Order of Europe," based upon the enslavement of all of the nations of Central, Western, Southern and Northern Europe, is turned into a weapon of furious aggressive war against a great socialist state, and against the United States of America, as well as against the British Commonwealth — and when the United States and Great Britain have entered an alliance for military destruction of that slave system—then surely the Hitler-enslaved realm can be described as an "organization of reaction to retard the more rapid development of America," and most assuredly to retard the more rapid development of the great new state of socialist industry and agriculture.

The United States, Great Britain, China and the Dutch East Indies, together with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and many other nations, making war to destroy the Hitler reaction, represent the cause of progressive humanity, and the victory of their combined forces can bring no slavery or loss of national freedom of any nation; the victory of their cause represents development of history forward.

IV

One of the most important tasks of today lies in the need of stripping away from the monument of Lenin the artificial, the super-imposed cloak of what bourgeois writers call *"the inscrutable"*—the veneer, the misshapen plaster covering stuck on to it over the solid granite of its true conformation—the sectarian idea that the art, the science of Lenin and Stalin is some eerie "foreign" thing, separate and apart from the normal ways of life—something "East of Suez, where there ain't no Ten Commandments"—something apart from the main stream of mankind's culture.

I think it is time to make a special effort, for the sake of the best possible defense of the national independence of all the peoples of the world, to show the *universal* participation of all streams of history in the making of the mighty current of this Amazon. We must especially insist on bringing forward none too modestly, for instance, the share of the great American participant in the founding of the Marxian science, the anthropologist Lewis Henry Morgan.

Morgan had, as Engels said, "in America, in his own way, rediscovered the materialist conception of history" (Engels: *Origin of the*

* Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. V, pp. 140-41.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Family, p. 5) which Marx had discovered in Europe by another approach. Morgan's *Ancient Society* was "one of the few epoch-making works of our times," which gave to the world a new discovery that had "the same significance for primitive history as Darwin's theory of evolution has for evolution, and Marx's theory of surplus value has for political economy." (*Ibid.*, pp. 14-15). The American scientist "speaking of a future transformation of society in words which Karl Marx might have used" (*Ibid.*, p. 16) placed a new cornerstone in the structure of the scientific laws of motion of society.

Why does it seem so strange to suggest that an American origin, among all the world-wide, multifold sources, can be found for the rich science of Marxism-Leninism? Engels himself explained it:

"Whence this reserve, which it is difficult not to regard as a conspiracy of silence . . . ? Is it because Morgan is an American . . . ? A German might be tolerated, but an American?" (*Ibid.*, p. 15.)

It is a good American fact that the *Marxian* work of Morgan was compiled and published at the expense of the United States Government, during the Grant Administration.

* * *

The form of government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a form determined by historic necessity and by the knowledge of that historic necessity that is found in the scientific works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. It is a form of unlimited power in the hands of the people of that socialist state. It is what it is called: the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is not something else, and it is not a modification or a softening down, it is in all reality the dictatorship of the proletariat, a concentration of unlimited power in the hands of a socialist people.

By the reactionary press that form of state which rules in Soviet Russia is made a bogey, a frightful contradiction of freedom.

Is it not interesting that the freedom of the whole world now depends to a large degree and immediately upon the strength of that great state? But is it not "foreign"? Is it not something frightful and bearded and ghastly and eerie and "un-American"?

No. Eighty years ago William Tecumseh Sherman, one of the intelligent military men of history, wrote a twenty-seven-hundred-word letter to President Abraham Lincoln that would have been a major historical document in its time if General Sherman had not refused President Lincoln's request to be allowed to publish it for distribution throughout the country. In this memorable letter, parts of which are reproduced in Carl Sandburg's *Lincoln*, the American general produced what may be called a constituent part of the then accumulating historic understanding of the question which in its more highly developed form was answered by the form of government that rules in the Soviet Union today. Of the slave-owning planters of the South, against whom Sherman was making war in defense of the life of the American republic, the general said to Lincoln:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"I know we can manage this class, but only by action. Argument is exhausted, and words have lost their meaning. Nothing but the logic of events touches their understanding; but of late this has worked a wonderful change. . . .

"No other choice is left to us but degradation. The [slave] South must be ruled by us, or she will rule us. We must conquer them, or ourselves be conquered. They ask, and will have, nothing else, and talk of compromise is bosh; for we know they would even scorn the offer. . . . I would not coax them, or even meet them half way, but make them so sick of war that generations would pass away before they would again appeal to it. . . .

"Our officers, marshals, and courts, must penetrate into the innermost recesses of their land, before we have the natural right to demand their submission . . . we will do it in our time and in our own way; that it makes no difference whether it be one year, or two, or ten, or twenty; that we will remove or destroy every obstacle, if need be, take every life, every acre of land, every particle of property, everything that to us seems proper; that we will not cease till the end is attained; that all who do not aid us are enemies, and that we will not account to them for our acts. If the people of the South oppose, they do so at their peril; and if they stand by, mere lookers-on in this domestic tragedy, they have no right to immunity, protection, or share in the final results."*

Sherman regarded the matter, not as it has become fashionable to see it—not as the "war between the states"—but as the *civil war* that it was, as a revolutionary struggle of modern capitalism against the effort to reverse the process of history, against the overthrow of this republic that Marx rightly said was at that time "the only popular government in the world." The slave power intended a *permanent* concentration of power in the hands of a resurrected medieval reaction. Sherman had in mind a *temporary* deprivation of the formerly slave-owning class of the South and their Northern Copperhead sympathizers, "of all voice in the future elections of the country," or that they be banished or "reduced to the conditions of a mere denizen."

Can there be any doubt that Sherman spoke for as energetic a dictatorship as the Russian workers later established, or insofar as such was at that time possible? And is there any doubt that a large part of the shortcomings of our American democracy arise out of the faltering and final withdrawal of the policy of federal enforcement of democracy in the former slave states—especially the failure and refusal to enforce the 14th Amendment to the Constitution?

Was not Lincoln denounced as a "Nero" and as a "Caligula," and did not the *London Times*, as though speaking of Lenin, express its rage that "President Lincoln calls to his aid the execrable expedient of a servile insurrection"—while the great American President's assassin shouted over his fallen body "sic semper tyrannis"?

* * *

Fifteen years before Sherman wrote his contribution to the world's

* Carl Sandburg: *Lincoln;* Vol. II, p. 390 et seq.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

understanding of historic necessity in times of great social upheavals, a young German editor by the name of Karl Marx had written:

"After a revolution, every provisional organization of the state requires a dictatorship, and an energetic dictatorship at that."*

The young Marx was writing about the republican revolution in Germany, a revolution in which the German capitalist class, represented by the ministry headed by Camphausen, was fumbling in its role of overthrow of feudal conditions. Of this bourgeois leader, Marx wrote:

"From the very beginning we have reproached Camphausen . . . for not acting dictatorially, for not having immediately smashed up and eliminated the remnants of the old institutions. And while Mr. Camphausen was thus rocking himself in constitutional dreams, the defeated party (*i.e.*, the party of reaction) strengthened its positions in the bureaucracy and in the army, and here and there even began to venture upon open struggle." **

Both Marx and Sherman spoke not of proletarian dictatorship but of dictatorship of the progressive republican forces. But let no one think that it does not apply with equal effect. Lenin said:

"Those who have not understood the necessity of the dictatorship of *any revolutionary class* for its victory have failed to understand anything of the history of the revolution, or else do not want to know anything about it." *** (My emphasis—*R.M.*)

Again it must be emphasized that Marx spoke for democracy, for the taking of terrific power into the hands of the progressive sections of the population of Germany. And does not every sensible man know that Germany's history has been scarred for nearly a century by its failure to follow such advice?

Twenty-three years later Marx made the application of the essential principle to the different class content of the Paris Commune, and called it the "dictatorship of the proletariat."

The *Short History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* fully claims this historic lineage. It says:

"Lenin held that following the victorious uprising of the people the tsarist government should be replaced by a provisional revolutionary government. It would be the task of the provisional revolutionary government to consolidate the conquests of the revolution, to crush the resistance of the counter-revolution and to give effect to the minimum program of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party. Lenin maintained that unless these tasks were accomplished, a decisive victory over tsardom would be impossible. And in order to accomplish these tasks and achieve a decisive victory over tsardom, the provisional revolutionary government would have to be not an ordinary kind of government, but a government of the dictatorship of the victorious classes, of the workers and peasants; it would have to be a revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. Citing Marx's well-known thesis that 'after a revolution every provisional organization of the state requires

* Cited by Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p. 246.
** *Ibid.*, p. 246.
*** *Ibid.*, p. 241.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a dictatorship, and an energetic dictatorship at that,' Lenin came to the conclusion that if the provisional revolutionary government was to ensure a decisive victory over tsardom, it could be nothing else but a dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry." (pp. 71-72.)

Sherman was right about several things.

And what would be the fate of our American democracy and that of England and of all of Europe and the world if the Red Army of Soviet Russia would not have behind it now that terrifically forceful power that is concentrated in the hands of the most progressive forces of history?

V.

Napoleon said: "A conqueror is always a lover of peace."

To which Clausewitz replied: "He would like to make his entry into our state unopposed; in order to prevent this, we must choose war, . . . so it is willed by the Art of War." (*On War,* Vol. II, p. 155.)

* * *

The little rat-man who has under his bloody rule the continent of Europe and of the classic cultural centers of the whole world outside of the Soviet Union and England—Hitler also *wants peace.*

Hitler will not get peace. He will get death. "Elimination of Hitlerite criminals is the first essential condition of peace." (*Pravda.)*

In the second year of the First World War Lenin wrote on the subject of peace, applying to this aspect of the question of war the same scientific principles that are to be found in his whole treatment of the subject of war. Lenin said:

"Just as all war is but the continuation by violent means of the politics which the belligerent states and the classes that rule in them have been conducting for many years, sometimes for decades before the outbreak of war, so the peace that succeeds every war can be nothing else than a summing up and registration of the changes in the relation of forces brought about in the course of and in consequence of the given war." *

In the early part of 1917, the German Government was in a position of advantage in the world war and found it to its interest to end the military operations and with a "registration of the actual changes in the relation of forces brought about in the course of and in consequence of the war,"** up to that time.

Lenin turned loose both his fury and the Marxian science against the attempt, saying:

"The pacifist simpletons of the neutral bourgeoisie have already been put 'into action': Wilhelm has loosened their tongues! And the pacifist . . . wiseacres among the Socialists, Turati in Italy, Kautsky in Germany, etc., etc., are exerting all their humanitarianism, their love of humanity, their celestial virtue (and their high intellect) to *embellish* the coming imperialist peace!" **

Today every force that supports the German conquest of the world is calling for peace. Lindbergh, whose program for England, France, and America he frankly stated as a

* *Ibid.,* Vol. V, p. 232.
** Lenin, *Collected Works,* Vol. XIX.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conquest of the Soviet Union by the German Nazi government, continues that program by calling for "negotiated peace," which means the stopping of military operations against Hitler and the freezing of the relation of forces at the stage where Hitler is in control of Western Europe and, Lindbergh would wish, undisturbed continuation of war where he pleased. The Nazi fifth column in the Argentine and all of Latin America asks for what is called "peace." The program of the Reverend Norman Thomas, head of the Socialist Party of the United States, which was and still is for military attack upon the Soviet Union by Nazi Germany, has for many months continued this program in the form of a demand for the registration of the present gains of Hitler through a "peace program" in the West and the continuation of the overt military phase of the struggle against the Soviet Union.

Up until almost the hour of the Axis attack on Pearl Harbor, the Hearst press ran the propaganda of the German Government in the form that it comes from the pen of an Englishwoman, Freda Utley. In its pristine form, the propaganda of this woman took the shape, as in the *Reader's Digest* of October, 1941, calling for "a peace which, though it would leave the continent of Europe under German domination, would at least save Britain and her Empire." And Americans can have from Hitler the "surest guarantee of America's future safety" by "not insisting on the impossible aim of freeing the Continent of Europe by war."

The sound commonsense understanding of the great military writer Clausewitz, which is in this case also a completely accurate expression of the scientific view of Marx and Lenin, was expressed in the classic reply to Napoleon, above quoted. We may say that Mr. Wendell Willkie, undoubtedly a spokesman for the solid bourgeoisie of America, has expressed the same valid outlook with the solid common sense that has become in the main America's foreign policy. Said Mr. Willkie in *Reader's Digest* of November, 1941:

"Would we have peace? Most certainly not. . . . Hitler would dominate the entire continent of Europe. He would have at his disposal all of its agricultural resources, mines and metals, factories, shipyards, munitions plants. He would distribute his troops wherever he wanted and run the continent on a military basis—the only basis he understands."

It would be a "war machine two or three times more powerful than the one he has at present," said Willkie. And what of the lullaby about the chance for the United States and Great Britain by "negotiating peace" with Hitler, to "remain two out of four great powers" —while "it would leave the Continent of Europe undr German domination"—as Miss Utley expressed it? Willkie replies with the naked truth:

"Hitler will never be able to subjugate the free peoples of the world until he has somehow crushed freedom in the United States. . . .

"Hitler, after a negotiated 'peace,'

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would wage political and economic warfare everywhere on earth. . . ."

Mr. Willkie demonstrates in terms of hardest realism that "we cannot negotiate a peace at all *until Hitler is defeated.*"

* * *

"Peace" slogans are the most precious angels of rescue for the little rat-man who has in his rodent claws the classical cultural centers of the world. Peace slogans would have what effect in the conquered countries of Europe, where the desperate but vain hope of Hitler is to persuade its peoples that there is some alternative other than the gallows for Hitler and destruction of the Hitler state?

To the problems of the peoples of Latin America it is true to say that only the victory of the united forces of the peoples of the world—each organizing and building up its own independent national military and naval force and entering into the all-out struggle—can assure that all of these countries will not enter into the bloody slave order of the Axis powers.

All must be fired with the knowledge that there can be no peace without the destruction of Hitler.

But "fate" will not win. Only *peoples* can win, and there is no fate that guarantees our own countries of the Western Hemisphere from conquest as long as the heroic army built by Lenin and Stalin is left "waging the liberation war alone without anyone's military aid, against the combined forces of the Germans, Finns, Rumanians, Italians and Hungarians." *

A slogan of peace today is the slogan of surrender, conquest and slavery. It is not an accident that the fifth column propagandists, in putting forward the slogan of "peace," tried to rationalize it with the words:

"But there is at least hope that with peace the foundations of Hitler tyranny might be destroyed.

"Peace might give a chance to other elements in Germany to assert themselves." (Freda Utley, N. Y. *Journal-American,* Nov. 16, 1941.)

The Leninist science would offer an answer borrowed from Clausewitz:

"Now, philanthropists may easily imagine there is a skilful method of disarming and overcoming an enemy without causing great bloodshed, and that this is the proper tendency in the Art of War. However plausible this may appear, still it is an error which must be extirpated; for in such dangerous things as war, the errors which proceed from a spirit of benevolence are the worst." (Clausewitz, *On War,* Vol. I, Book I, p. 3.)

There can be no peace without the military annihilation of the Hitler Axis—the national liberation of the peoples of Europe and Asia and Africa, and the security from slavery of the peoples of the Western Hemisphere, by the ruthless application of the utmost military force for the destruction of the Axis headed by the rat-man in Berlin.

* *Stalin Speaks to the World,* Workers Library Publishers, p. 7.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SHOULD THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT JOIN IN CONCERTED ACTION AGAINST THE FASCIST STATES? *

BY EARL BROWDER

EDITORIAL FOREWORD

WE REPUBLISH here the historic speech that Earl Browder made in a debate on the question of war at Madison Square Garden, New York, May 4, 1938, with certain deletions of passages no longer essential for this time and the more developed situation. And we republish it because it semes to us to be one of the most prophetic documents of the period of development into the present war, and at the same time, if rightly understood, to be a flaming thundering call to action today in the present war.

If one were to forget the *date* on which the speech was made, one could overlook, misunderstand, and even distort into its opposite, the real meaning of the speech. The struggle then was a struggle against the forces that were marching from diplomatic conquest to diplomatic conquest on the road to plunging the world into the present universal war. Therefore, in speaking for the curbing of the imperialist aggressors, against the warmakers, Browder logically and inevitably spoke of the struggle to unite the peoples against the aggressors as a struggle for world *peace*. But these terms have been changed by history. The struggle is against the same warmakers; but it is against warmakers who have now *already destroyed world peace*. Those whom Browder then justly called "the enemies of world peace" are *now* crying for "negotiated peace" with Hitler as the recognized conqueror of Europe; and in a little less overt form for "negotiated peace" with the Asiatic wing of the Hitler Axis in control of the decisive sections of Asia. Therefore Browder, if he could speak today and were not locked in prison by the United States Government as a policy of fearful concession to the friends of Hitler and imperialist Japan in America, would no longer speak in terms of *peace*.

Browder said: "The United States holds in its hands the key to world peace," and spoke of the danger that they would fumble this key and

* Extracts from a historic speech in the affirmative by Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., in the debate with Frederick J. Libby, Executive Secretary, National Council for Prevention of War, at Madison Square Garden, New York, May 4, 1938. Reprinted from *Fighting for Peace* by Earl Browder, International Publishers, pp. 82-109.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

drop it. They *did* "fumble" this key, and *did* "drop" it into the fire of war; it has melted and is out of shape, and it cannot open any doors; it must be beaten into a sword and plunged through the ugly vitals of the Nazi Axis—and only then can its metal be beaten back into the form of a "key to world peace."

The key to world peace today is a sword. This is the position of Browder, the position of Browder's party.

Browder's inspired words: "They have abandoned the very idea of peace," were true in May, 1938—but what a brilliant new light has been thrown upon this thought of the great Communist leader by occurrences since his voice was silenced in prison! Lindbergh, the present foremost Nazi spokesman in America, has openly stated that his purpose has never been peace. In the same Madison Square Garden where Browder spoke, Lindbergh has said that his desire was and his advice to the French and British Governments was that these and all other great states *should support Hitler in war against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;* that the aim of the Quislings has never been peace, but war. But again the American Quislings have raised the blinding slogan of "peace." And again their purpose is not peace, but the demoralization of the forces that, if they are not demoralized, will destroy Hitler. The struggle today is against the same forces that Browder fought until he was silenced in prison. Not alone Lindbergh, but Hamilton Fish and Martin Dies have been brought by the strange procession of history into a new Klieg light. Congressman Hamilton Fish, whose secretary was found guilty in a criminal court at the time these lines are written, on charges connected with the use of a Congressional frank for the distribution of the "peace" propaganda of the Axis powers—this same Hamilton Fish said in Congress: that he has "a high regard" for a friend of his whom he described as "a distinguished citizen of my state" who, he said, "was an agent of some Japanese firm, or the Japanese Government, not many months ago at a large compensation" and was "creating good will, spreading so-called propaganda" for the Japanese Government which as everyone then knew was preparing its murderous assault against the United States. Congressman Martin Dies has for nearly four years given protection to Nazi and fascist propaganda activities that were rampant in this country as a prelude to the present war, and befriended the German Nazi Bund and the Kyffhauser Bund, even employing sympathizers of such groups in tracking down and slandering the American labor movement. These are the Quislings.

We would call particular attention further only to those remarks of Browder in regard to those who claimed that "the United States is entirely immune from foreign invasion," and those who said that the Communists were seeking a "preventive war." Browder's answer to those hideous lies—which were organic parts of the German-Japanese fascist military plan for war

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against the United States—strikes the mind of the reader today with staggering force. We think of the dive-bombers at Pearl Harbor, when we read these prophetic words.

MY TASK tonight is to sustain the position that the United States, in the interests of preserving world peace, should take part in concerted international action to restrain the fascist war-making governments.

It is in the interest of clarity that Mr. Libby is the spokesman for the opposite point of view, because he is the most consistent spokesman for the neutrality bloc which promises to keep America out of war through isolationist policies.

Before we examine any proposals directed toward world peace, perhaps we should first answer the question—is world peace worth preserving? The most prominent spokesmen for the so-called neutrality policy have generally agreed that it is not worth the effort. They have abandoned the very idea of world peace. They have substituted the acceptance of an inevitable general world war. Some of them even consider that such a war will be of benefit to the rest of the world. They agree only that America should at all costs keep out of the war and, therefore, faced with a world in danger of war, keep out of world affairs.

Allow me to speak against all of these ideas. It is possible to halt those forces which are dragging the world toward war. It is worthwhile doing this because, however bad may be the peace precariously maintained at present, it is better than war. To attempt to isolate America from world affairs, at a moment when her moral and economic influence could be decisive in the interests of peace, means in reality to surrender the world to the war-makers, to make America their partner and, finally, to bring that war to the whole American people.

Is it possible to identify the enemies of world peace? Is it possible to direct our main effort toward restraining them? Mr. Libby and his friends say no. They say all governments are equally guilty of threatening world peace. They say any attempt to identify the war-makers means an arbitrary and unreal classification of governments as "angels" and "devils." They place in the criminals' dock the government of the United States and President Roosevelt alongside the Nazi regime and Hitler. In the present state of the world it seems rather childish to find it necessary to argue against such a point of view. The whole world knows who it is that sends invading armies across borders and against other nations. The whole world knows who is conducting aggressive war on other people's territory and who threatens further war. It is not at all necessary to look for "angels" and "devils," but only to ask who aggressively cross their own borders. They are the governments of the self-styled anti-Communist alliance, the governments headed by Hitler, Mussolini and the Mikado. If it is desirable to restrain the war-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

makers, then it is possible to identify them without the slightest doubt. It is further possible to deal with them as a group, because they are associated with common aims.

Perhaps, however, the war-makers are so powerful and so well placed that the peoples and governments who seek peace cannot hope to restrain them, and must of necessity retreat or surrender? But most obviously this is not true. The war-making governments control—by terror and suppression—not more than 10 per cent of the population of the world. Their control of economic resources is certainly no more favorable to them. Mr. Libby assumes that it is even more favorable to the peace-seeking peoples by identifying the war-makers as the "have-not" nations. The peace-seeking peoples occupy the most strategic positions geographically, which makes the isolation of the war-makers a relatively simple technical problem. Finally, the peace-seekers have an enormous moral advantage. They express the desire of all peoples, even those controlled by the fascist governments, for peace. This moral advantage can consolidate not only the overwhelming majority of the peace-seeking nations behind a positive peace policy, but it is also capable of arousing the oppressed millions under the fascist governments, once the easy victories of the dictators come to an end. The peace-seeking peoples have an overwhelming advantage in numbers and resources, in geographical and moral positions. They are superior in every factor which can influence the course of world affairs—except the will to use their advantage. This missing factor I wish to help produce. Mr. Libby is against producing the missing factor. This is the essential difference between us.

What is the secret of the success of the fascists in their drive toward world domination? It is an open secret which the whole world knows. It is the division among the peace-seekers. The war-making powers know what they want and move toward it concertedly and ruthlessly. They take one bite at a time out of the world they wish to devour entirely. Manchuria was taken by the Japanese militarists, while the rest of the world did nothing except utter moral condemnation. Ethiopia was invaded by Mussolini—and the gestures of restraint were carefully calculated not to be effective, and quickly abandoned when they inconvenienced Mussolini. The demilitarized Rhineland was occupied and fortified by the Nazis—and again there was only the reading of a moral lecture. Spain is invaded by Hitler and Mussolini and subjected to the most ferocious slaughter—and the peace-seeking nations respond by treating the Spanish republic as the criminal to be quarantined. Austria is invaded and wiped out as an independent nation—and Mr. Libby, with his associates of the neutrality bloc, hail the event as "a step toward stability." It is clear that the fascists succeed in dragging the world into war because the peace forces of the Western democracies are divided; they have no general

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plan of action; many of them desert one another; they act with the greatest consideration toward the fascist war-makers and the greatest lack of consideration toward their victims. The majority of peace-seeking nations, the bourgeois-democratic countries, have allowed themselves to become confused and paralyzed by the threat of fascist aggression from without and by the demagogic trickery of powerful reactionary minorities within.

It is clear that the whole problem is that of defeating the reactionary minorities within, and achieving some degree of a common front among the peace-seeking nations. The trump card of my opponent and his associates of the neutrality bloc, upon which they gamble all their chips, is, in the last analysis, the confusion and disunity among the peace-seeking peoples and their assumption that this condition is not remediable. They assume that there is no leadership capable of bringing any unity among the peace-seekers. They point to the fact that when the Soviet Union, through the Litvinov proposals, gives the initiative to this end, the Western democracies are silent, refusing to allow the land of socialism to lead the peace forces. They point to the fact that when the Mexican republic, through President Cardenas, offers a similar initiative, the great democracies are too proud to take a lead from one of the smaller nations. They point to the fact that Britain, assumed to be among the democracies, has turned her back on the goal of organized peace and, under the leadership of Chamberlain, is making her own terms with the war-makers at the expense of the rest of the world. They point to the fact that the French republic, itself saved from a fascist insurrection only by the hasty erection of the *Front Populaire,* is paralyzed by fear and drags at the apron-strings of Chamberlain. Where, they triumphantly ask, is there a leadership which can bring any stability into this swamp of indecision and cowardice?

There is not the slightest desire on my part to evade or underestimate any of these difficulties. It is only by facing them fully and frankly that we can find the way to overcome them. But we declare that it is possible to overcome all difficulties, it is possible to organize the world peace front. This is possible, however, only on condition that we set ourselves this task, that we refuse to surrender either to our own difficulties or to the threats of the war-makers. We declare that the alternative is to surrender the world to universal catastrophe.

From where can the leadership come that has the possibility of organizing the peace forces of the world? We propose that it shall come from the United States. The United States has the strongest selfish interest in peace, without which it cannot maintain world commerce so necessary to it under the present system. We say that the United States is in the privileged position of being able to assume world leadership for peace without serious danger to itself. The United States holds in its hands the key to world peace. The question before us is,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shall we hesitate, fumble and drop this key through fear or incapacity? If we do, that will be the most unprofitable and most shameful page in American history.

Let us, before we proceed further, examine in more detail this privileged position in which the United States finds itself. I am glad to note that on this point Mr. Libby agrees with me. He has written several times recently that the United States is entirely immune from foreign invasion. In February, 1938, he wrote: "We should give due consideration to the fact, which is vouched for by leading military and naval experts, that our country cannot be invaded. . . . We cannot have a war, therefore, unless we seek it abroad." I will leave it to Mr. Libby to establish this point in detail. I accept it as substantially correct with two important qualifications: first, that it is true only for the immediate period and the present world relation of forces, but will be changed substantially if the fascist governments succeed in subjugating Western Europe and China; and second, it is true only for continental United States and does not apply to the Philippines, Hawaii and the Pacific Islands, or Alaska. I must, however, draw opposite conclusions from those of Mr. Libby from these facts. He says that, since we are safe, we should risk nothing for the peace of the world. I say, precisely because we are safe for the present we, above all, must take the leadership in preserving the peace of the world, which is also to guarantee our own peace for the future.

A further feature of America's privileged position is our unexampled economic resources. Not only has the United States almost half of the world's accumulated wealth and productive resources, but we are also most nearly, among all nations, economically self-sufficient. Considering the greater mobility of American wealth and production, we can easily say that the economic weight of our country in world affairs is equal to, or greater than, that of all other countries combined. . . .

Of course, we are keenly conscious that anyone who advocates world peace in this practical way will be charged with being in favor, in reality, of a preventive war against the fascist powers. I feel certain that Mr. Libby will repeat this charge tonight as he has been making it heretofore at every opportunity. When President Roosevelt, in his famous Chicago speech advocating quarantine of the aggressors, gave a brief indication of such a positive peace policy as I am defending, the neutrality advocates joined in the shout that this was a policy of dragging America into war. But what do we actually propose?. . .

We propose that the United States should distinguish between those nations which violate their obligations to us to refrain from warlike aggression against their neighbors, obligations which they voluntarily assumed by solemn treaty, and those governments which on the contrary observe these treaty obligations. We propose that the United States shall cut off all eco-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nomic intercourse with those governments which violate the Kellogg Pact outlawing war, and shall maintain and extend our economic relations with the governments which observe their treaty obligations and especially with those who are victims of aggression. We propose that the United States shall follow a policy designed to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations.

The whole substance of the policy which I defend here is embodied in the provisions of the O'Connell Peace Bill, which is now before Congress.

What would be the result of the application of this policy? It would mean the immediate lifting of the embargo against republican Spain—a shameful embargo which was an unfriendly act against a democratic government, a violation of our own treaty obligations and against the interests of America. In its place, it would lay an embargo against all commercial and economic relations with Germany, Italy and Japan, as well as against Franco's armies of invasion in Spain. It would mean that American scrap iron, cotton, chemicals and machinery would stop going to Japan to assist the enslavement of the Chinese people. It would mean stopping the hundreds of thousands of aerial bombs now being shipped from America to Hitler. It would mean the complete divorce of American economy from its present service to the war-making governments.

Mr. Libby is already on record that this does not create the danger that the fascist governments will counter such an embargo by making war against the United States. But many of his friends in the neutrality bloc do not agree with him on this. In particular, Dr. Charles E. Beard, speaking for an important part of the neutrality bloc, has written in the *New Republic* directly against the policy I am defending, that if the United States ever undertook such a task, then in all likelihood the fascist powers in a "war frenzy," "a spirit of world power or downfall," "would strike back" and make war against the United States. Against this argument of the Beard section of the neutrality bloc I place the evidence of Mr. Libby himself that "our country cannot be invaded, we cannot have a war unless we seek it abroad." Unfortunately the unity of the neutrality bloc is an unprincipled one, and Mr. Libby and Dr. Beard simply agree to disagree on this point, without in any way disturbing their harmonious cooperation in keeping America isolated at all costs. This difference of opinion between them is merely a division of labor. Mr. Libby is to round up for neutrality all those who will agree on the basis of the argument of safety, while Dr. Beard shall round up those who can be scared into neutrality by the threat of immediate invasion.

Would this policy, which is embodied in the O'Connell Peace Bill, bring the United States into entangling alliances or limit our freedom of decision and action? Not in the slightest. We propose that the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States should assume no special obligations toward any government except the obligation of impartially applying this policy to all and sundry. Once the policy is established, of course, it is assumed that the United States would welcome the adherence to the same sort of policy by as many governments as would wish to do so or which could be persuaded to do so. We know in advance that some important powers will immediately follow the lead of the United States, among them certainly the Soviet Union and Mexico. We can assume that the people of France would greet such action by the United States with the deepest joy, because it would liberate their People's Front government from its humiliating bondage to the pro-fascist, tory government of England. We can reasonably expect that, with such a profound change in the relation of world forces, the British Labor Party would shake off its present paralysis of fear, and actively rally the peace-loving majority of the English people behind it. We can be absolutely certain that, as a result of such a policy, the peoples of Spain and China would be enormously strengthened in their heroic struggle against the fascist invaders and would quickly administer for the first time some decisive military blows against the invaders and thus realize in the most practical fashion the popular slogan, "Take the profits out of war." . . .

Is there any danger that with such a policy the United States would become a catspaw for the sinister ambitions of other powers? Would there be any danger of falling under the domination of "perfidious Albion," or raking British chestnuts out of the fire? This is the great bogeyman of one section of Mr. Libby's neutrality bloc. His associate, Mr. Quincy Howe, has written a whole book on the subject, the conclusion of which is that the British tories are so damnably clever and Americans such constitutional simpletons that the only way we can avoid being the catspaw of British imperialism is by complete withdrawal from world affairs. But, strangely enough, neither Mr. Howe nor any other Anglophobe has the slightest difficulty continuing in the closest comradeship with Mr. Libby when he praises the Chamberlain tory government for capitulation to Mussolini, says this is the only path to peace, and openly advises the United States to model its own foreign policy on the example of Chamberlain. Strangely enough, they fear British imperialism only if the Labor Party should come to power and swing England to the support of a world peace front headed by the United States. But they are quite complacent toward a British imperialism expressed in Chamberlain's alliance with fascism and even want us to follow England along that shameful road.

Would the policy that we propose require us to break with the great American traditions in foreign policy? No, on the contrary, precisely this policy, and only this, would give us a continuation of that greatest of all American traditions in this field that was established by Thomas Jefferson as Secretary of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

State under Washington's administration. At that time the young and weak American republic, occupying a position far removed from our present overwhelming strength, was not afraid, in the interests of peace and democracy, to boldly challenge the reactionary aggressors and align itself on the side of their victim. . . .

What America needs today, what the world needs, is a foreign policy based upon these lines of Thomas Jefferson. The general line of such a policy has been proposed by President Roosevelt. . . .

Let us pass on to the consideration of some of the typical and standard arguments of the isolationist school of thought, which Mr. Libby shares and which must be answered here. One of the most used is the argument that America must not take sides against the war-makers, because, while they may be formally violating treaties and world peace, in reality this is only because they have been unjustly dealt with; that they are the "proletariat among nations," that they represent the "have-not" peoples, whose demands must be vindicated, against the rich nations, against the "haves." We cannot join with Mr. Libby in assuming that, even if this were true, America should assist or condone the resort to war to remedy the supposed grievances. But we challenge the assumption of Mr. Libby's facile classification into "haves" and "have-nots." If we are to assist the "have-nots" against the "haves," then surely we must assist Ethiopia take possession of Italy and not the other way around; we must help Manchuria to some of the Japanese wealth; we must help the Chinese people make Japanese economy serve their great needs and not the other way around. The wildest stretch of even Mr. Libby's imagination cannot paint Czechoslovakia as a "have" nation in contrast with Nazi Germany, which threatens its destruction. It is true that the bandit governments, when they have gobbled up the small and most "have-not" countries, will move toward the object of their greater ambitions, the wealthy countries, and, above all, the United States, but that is only the music of the future. I have yet to hear Mr. Libby or any of his associates propose that that half of the world's wealth which is held by less than 10 per cent of the world's population, that of the United States, should be divided up among the other nations of the world in order to bring about that equality among the peoples which would wipe out this classification of "haves" and "have-nots." Perhaps Mr. Libby does believe that America's wealth should be so distributed. If so, he should tell us tonight. If not, he should drop the meaningless classification of "haves" and "have-nots," which is only a shame-faced justification for fascist aggression. It is an interesting historical sidelight on this argument that it was Japanese imperialism which taught this slogan to Mr. Libby and his friends, which first justified military aggression against weaker peoples on the grounds that the aggressor was hard up, a "proletarian among the nations," and needed the booty. Every common

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

criminal is equally justified in his crime.

But Mr. Libby, in common with all his associates, strenuously objects to the introduction of moral standards into the relations between nations. They say it is unrealistic and dangerous. They say this is the unreal classification of governments into "angels" and "devils." They cry, we all are sinners together, therefore let none pass moral judgment upon his neighbor. Since Mr. Libby is personally a Quaker and a pacifist and also, if he draws the logical conclusions from his position, a philosophical anarchist who would desire the immediate dissolution of all governments, there is a certain logic and consistency in his position, but for the great majority of workaday Americans, who are not Quakers, are not pacifists and not anarchists, this summary dismissal of moral standards from the field of foreign relations is unacceptable. We are too keenly conscious of the results of such an attitude in the destruction of the standards of morals and justice between man and man, of the disintegration of all social ties, that must flow from the adoption of amorality as our guiding principle in international relations. The advocates of neutrality and isolation argue for the acceptance of international anarchy as the permanent condition of world affairs. We declare that the time has come when the continuation of civilization itself, in America as everywhere, depends upon world organization to enforce a minimum moral standard among nations. . . .

Some of Mr. Libby's associates, whose collaboration he has gladly welcomed in joining the so-called Committee to Keep America Out of War, try to ridicule us, the members of the Communist Party, for our championship of international morality. Particularly, Norman Thomas, Jay Lovestone, Bertram Wolfe, accuse us that thereby we have abandoned the teachings of Marx and Lenin, have abandoned our revolutionary Communist principles. They, on their part, claim to uphold the teachings of Marx and Lenin by ridiculing moral standards between nations as a guiding principle. By this, however, they only expose their own hostility to the teachings of Marx and Lenin, their own renegacy from the revolutionary principles of Socialism. Against all such arguments allow me to quote to you somewhat extensively from the Inaugural Address to the First International written by Karl Marx in 1864. Dealing with the tsarist conquest of the Caucasus, the suppression of the Polish uprising, and the Russo-Turkish war, current events of the day, Marx said:

". . . The shameless approval, mock sympathy, or idiotic indifference, with which the upper classes of Europe have witnessed the mountain fortress of the Caucasus falling a prey to, and heroic Poland being assassinated by, Russia; the immense and unresisted encroachments of that barbarous power, whose head is at St. Petersburg, and whose hands are in every cabinet of Europe, have taught the working classes the duty to master them-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selves the mysteries of international politics; to watch the diplomatic acts of their respective governments; to counteract them, if necessary, by all means in their power; when unable to prevent, to combine in simultaneous denunciations, and *to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercouse of nations.*

"The fight for such a foreign policy forms part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working class."* (Italics mine.—*E.B.)*

Here, in the very words of Marx, we have formulated the precise description of the policy we urge upon the United States today. We propose nothing else than that the United States shall establish as the guiding principle of its foreign policy "to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations." Marx himself tells us that the fight for such a foreign policy forms part of that general struggle for the emancipation of the working class. This is just as profoundly true today as it was when Marx first wrote it in 1864.

Mr. Libby and most of his associates deny there is any relationship between alignments on foreign policy and those on domestic issues. But we cannot accept this shallow separation of the two. We admit quite readily, of course, the continued existence of great confusion among the masses and among some of their leaders, but we believe this confusion is being rapidly dispelled. Just as in the domestic political issues of our country, so also on foreign policy, we find the growth of two new political camps which cut across old party lines, one the camp of progress and democracy, the other the camp of reaction and fascism. The camp of reaction and fascism in our domestic life is the main force behind the policy of neutrality and isolation. The camp of progress and democracy is the main force behind the policy of concerted action under American leadership to restrain the fascist war-making governments. When Mr. Libby called upon his followers recently to rejoice, because, as he expressed it, "Hoover resumes leadership in international affairs," and joyously reported Hoover's return from a visit with Hitler and his complete rejection of the theory of concerted efforts against aggressor states, we have a right and a duty to ask what this means in the domestic life of our country. When Mr. Libby advises us to listen to Boake Carter for our radio interpretation of the news, when he asks us to agree with William Randolph Hearst's editorials on foreign affairs, when he asks us to get inspiration from Father Coughlin's radio sermons—all in the interest of peace—we have the right and the duty to ask him what kind of company is he getting us into, what will be the effect of this kind of leadership on the daily life of our country? . . .

On the other hand, we have the

* *Founding of the First International*, International Publishers, pp. 38-39.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

following significant alignment of forces on the side which I am defending tonight:

Organized labor, both of the American Federation of Labor and the Committee for Industrial Organization, overwhelmingly support President Roosevelt's Chicago call for quarantining the aggressor, as well as the O'Connell Peace Bill. Most of the articulate intellectual circles, university professors, students, writers, are, in great majority, supporting the O'Connell Bill for concerted action against the aggressors. Church organizations, outside of the Catholic hierarchy, are at least three-fourths on the same side. The political forces aligned with the New Deal are almost unanimously in its favor. The great student-strike movement on April 27 marched at least 90 per cent under the banner of lifting the embargo against Spain and the adoption of the O'Connell Peace Bill. In a recent gathering of peace advocates called in Washington, with the participation of Mr. Libby himself, with the objective of turning attention away from concerted action and toward abstract problems of world economics, a revolt among the guests against the program of the leadership of this conference disclosed the majority on the side of concerted action to restrain the fascist war-makers. During the past six months the progressive majority of the American people have decisively broken away from the false neutrality policy. They are emphatically supplementing their progressive and democratic platform in domestic affairs with a progressive and democratic foreign policy, the policy of quarantining the aggressors. At the same time all the forces of reaction are gathering for a desperate last-stand fight to maintain the old, bankrupt, neutrality policy. . . .

The fascist bloc of war-making powers operates under the flag of the anti-Communist alliance. The neutrality bloc within America agrees with the slogan of Hitler that the menace of Communism and of the Communists is what is endangering the peace of the world. Because the American people are so overwhelmingly against fascism, our own domestic anti-Communist alliance says it is against fascism and Communism, but in all their arguments and in their practical activities we find the menace of fascism figures very little, if at all, and their main concern is to fight Communism. And who are the Communists? The anti-Communist alliance certainly is not primarily concerned with my small party. Their definition of Communism is so broad that it includes the New Deal and President Roosevelt himself, especially it includes the policy of quarantining the war-making governments. The anti-Communist slogan in America has exactly the same significance as Hitler's use of this same slogan to establish his bloody dictatorship over the German people. It has exactly the same significance as the same cry against the Spanish republic. It is preparation for the fascist destruction of democracy and the republic also in America.

The organization for which Mr. Libby speaks has declared officially

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that it "does not cooperate with Communists or fascists." I do not question that this prohibition against cooperation with fascists is applied to the open, self-labeled fascist groups in America. But these are not the most dangerous expressions of fascism in our country. Hitler also spoke against fascism when he was fighting for power; he operated under the slogan of Socialism; he called his party the *National Socialist Party*. We must not be surprised that American fascism is taking on the banners of democracy and even of labor. Who can forget our famous "Liberty League," even though the du Ponts would like to have us forget it? And with these, the most dangerous, fascists who sail under the flag of liberty as Hitler did under the flag of Socialism, are precisely the most powerful and welcome supporters of Mr. Libby's viewpoint. Must I mention any names other than those of Hamilton Fish, Father Coughlin and William Randolph Hearst to substantiate this charge?

Mr. Libby's organization does not cooperate with Communists, they say. Surely they do not cooperate with the Communist Party, for on the question of the road to peace we stand in opposite camps; but when they can find anyone who calls himself Communist, but who at the same time supports neutrality and isolation, then we find Mr. Libby and his organization are quite ready for the closest collaboration. Mr. Libby is a member of the Committee to Keep America Out of War. This body was launched at a meeting in the Hippodrome, New York, on March 9, at which Mr. Libby sat on the platform. Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard, the meeting's chairman, praised one of the speakers, Mr. Bertram Wolfe, as "the tireless organizer" of the whole affair. Mr. Wolfe calls himself a Communist. He made a speech at that meeting, in which he declared that in case of war between the United States and Japan he proposed to work for the defeat of the United States. Not Mr. Libby nor any of his associates on that platform repudiated that slogan at the meeting or since, and they continue to work together in close alliance. Mr. Libby may reply that Mr. Wolfe is not really a Communist at all. That is absolutely true, and we would like to emphasize this to the whole world. Mr. Wolfe has for years, however, maintained close connections with the Bukharin group in the Soviet Union, the leaders of which a few weeks ago were executed for applying in the most practical way in that country the slogan that Mr. Wolfe put forth for America, the defeat of our own country in a possible war with Japan. Is it too much to ask Mr. Libby if he agrees to collaborate with people who call themselves Communists only provided they stand for the defeat of the United States in case of a war with Japan? Or does he agree to collaborate with that kind of self-styled Communist only because he knows they are not Communists at all but sail under a false flag? And may we ask what Mr. Libby thinks about this use of the slogan for the defeat of our government when faced with a fascist power, when this slogan is put forth

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the same platform on which he sits, under the auspices of an organization of which he is a leading member? . . . We declare that if, in spite of all our efforts for peace, Mr. Libby's policy should prevail and therefore war should in fact occur between Japan and the United States, then we consider that the interest of world progress, of peace, of democracy, of the independence of China's four hundred millions, of the future of America and of the Japanese people itself, all joined to demand the defeat of Japan's militarist government in such a war, and we would make that defeat a major guiding consideration of our whole policy under present world relationships.

The greatest danger to the peace of the whole world is the retreat of the peace-seeking nations before the fascist offensive. The fascist menace has grown on its easy victories. If this course is not stopped, the fascist war aggression will soon be on American soil itself. This is apparent to anyone with the slightest knowledge of the course of world affairs since 1931. Yet, the neutrality bloc and not least its spokesman, Mr. Libby, find their only hope of world peace in continued retreats and surrenders to the fascist powers.

Within the past few weeks Mr. Libby's official organ, a publication called *Peace Action,* often under Mr. Libby's signature, has expressed an attitude toward current events which is identical with Chamberlain's in London and leads in the same direction of coming to agreement with fascism on its own terms. With regard to Austria they expressed "relief to have this inevitable union over with" and concluded that "it will be a step toward stability." They are satisfied that "The future of Spain is apparently in process of solution . . . in the discussions between Chamberlain and Mussolini." They are hopeful that Czechoslovakia "will now sever itself from Russia and develop its ties with Germany." They declare that "Danzig belongs to Germany and will return to Germany." They express the hope that Germany and Poland, while settling the Corridor problem, will also decide without disagreement the fate of Memel and, presumably, also of Lithuania. They say "these changes . . . should have been made years ago." They urge the United States to follow in the Far East the same disgraceful course Chamberlain has followed in the Mediterranean, toward Hitler, and toward Spain. In judging the effects of Franco's recent military successes in Spain they cannot see in this any new menace to European peace; on the contrary, they conclude. "Europe is much nearer peace today than it was a month ago." These are quotations from the current issues of *Peace Action,* edited by Mr. Libby. In not one single issue of that paper, not one single article, not a paragraph, not a sentence, can be found a word in condemnation of Hitler, Mussolini or the Mikado, as the violators of world peace. And all of this, which clearly represents the path of surrender to the war-makers and to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fascism, is presented as "peace action." Such is the conclusion to which neutrality will bring all its adherents if they do not break once and for all with that bankrupt policy.

Those for whom I speak, and on this I am sure I speak the mind of the majority of the American people, see in every victory of the fascist war-makers a darker gathering of clouds of war over the world, including America. We declare Chamberlain's criminal sellout has stimulated every reactionary and war-making force. We see in the conquest of Austria a knife in the back of the Czechoslovakian republic, the last oasis of democracy in central Europe, which can stand only by unity with France and the Soviet Union. We find Spain's contribution to world peace in the heroic republican forces that brought Franco's foreign armies to a halt. We find the hope of the Far East in China's magnificent national unity and military successes against the Japanese. In short, we see every one of the questions from the exactly opposite viewpoint of Hitler, Mussolini and the Mikado, and therefore from the exactly opposite viewpoint of my opponent of this evening and of his associates. They see peace only in the victory of the fascist dictators; we see peace only in the defeat and destruction of fascism. That is why my opponent wants the United States to continue helping the fascist dictators; that is why we demand that the United States shall take the lead in concerted efforts to halt them.

Would a courageous initiative by the United States against the war-makers receive enough support in the world to defeat them? Yes, we would have overwhelming support if we displayed a firm policy. It is certain the Soviet Union would wholeheartedly support such a policy. We would end the hesitations of the French government and its dependence upon Britain. We would encourage British democracy to throw over the cynical Chamberlain. America alone could change the whole course of world affairs by our moral and economic influence. We could ensure the victory of the Spanish republic, which was almost at the point of victory several times while American influence was thrown the other way. We could ensure the victory of China which, without our help, is already bringing Japan to the verge of collapse. The defeat of the war-makers in these two areas would shatter the myth of their inevitable victory, would release the democratic aspirations of their own people, who would quickly abolish their defeated dictators. And we could do all that without the slightest danger of involving the United States in war. Failure to do this will create for us the danger of war. The United States enjoyed for a time a privileged position. This makes it our inescapable responsibility to use this position to help organize the peace of a world in which no other land is so fortunately situated. If we delay too long, our immunity will quickly disappear in a world made victim to fascist aggression, con-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quest and destruction. By acting now against the war-makers of the world, we *can* keep America out of war.

Mr. Libby has told us tonight quite openly that he proposes, as the way to peace, to make the fascist nations prosperous. If we make them prosperous enough, they will stop threatening us with war. I asked Mr. Libby if he was prepared for that purpose of dividing American wealth among the fascist nations. He did not answer that directly, but I think we can see that this is the logical conclusion which must be drawn from his remarks.

Mr. Libby expressed agreement with us on some points. But it is a strange agreement. I said neutrality is murder. Mr. Libby says he agrees with me that neutrality is not enough. . . .

As a matter of fact, Mr. Libby relies mainly, for bringing you around to his point of view, upon telling you about the terrible, terrible things that are going to happen when "the boys come home." He wants to frighten us by telling us what our enemies are planning against us, the terrible things that Hitler is going to plan against us if we cross him. He forgets one thing: the fascists abroad and at home will make their plans, but when it comes to executing these plans we are going to have something to say about the question.

Mr. Libby is disturbed because I don't propose that the United States go to war; and as most of his argument is directed toward the horror of war, he must conclude in spite of everything that I do propose war, so he says "an embargo against the war-makers is a war measure." But, my dear Mr. Libby, we propose an embargo against the war-makers; you propose an embargo against both the war-makers and their victims; therefore, you propose war against both of them, war against friend and enemy alike. You say embargo is an act of war, but the whole purpose of the Neutrality Act is designed to place the embargo against both war-makers and victims—if the embargo is war, you propose twice as much war as we propose, war against the whole world.

Mr. Libby assured us that if we dare take action against the fascist dictators, this will only consolidate the people of these countries behind their dictatorships, and he draws a picture following the American declaration of embargo of the women of Italy rushing with their wedding rings to Mussolini. But what is the truth of this? These dictators live upon the cheap victories presented to them by policies such as Mr. Libby wants us to follow. When those cheap victories stop, the dictators will fall. One good stiff licking is enough to finish Hitler, because, so far from having the support of the German people, Hitler can exist only so long as he can create the appearance of invincible power that even forces the British lion to crawl at his feet. The moment that illusion is wiped away, at that moment the house of cards of fascism will begin to tumble. . . .

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NATION AND THE WAR

BY ROBERT MINOR

[*EDITORIAL NOTE: Plenary meetings of the National Committee of the Communist Party are never unimportant. But the plenum which was held on December 6 and 7, 1941, carried almost a unique historic importance, marked as it was by the outbreak of the final form of violence in war directly against the United States by the German Nazi-Japanese-Italian Axis. This plenary meeting was interrupted on its second day by the Japanese dive-bomb attack on Pearl Harbor. But so completely did this "interruption" by the stark forms of bloody war fit into the picture of the world situation as we saw it—that it was, so to say, less of an interruption than a confirmation of the validity of judgment and line of action of our party, which even on the morning prior to the Pearl Harbor attack had already unanimously outlined the view of our Party of the inevitable coming of such events and had given its warning to the nation.*

In this article and the one which follows we publish extracts from the main report of the Political Committee, made in two parts, the first by Robert Minor, Acting Secretary, and the second by William Z. Foster, National Chairman.]

Introduction

AT THE last full meeting of this National Committee five and a half months ago—just six days after the invasion of the Soviet Union by the hordes of German fascism—our party made a characterization of the war which, despite the storm of denunciation that was raised against us, has now been confirmed as absolutely sound and correct by the whole American nation in the hard and realistic terms of action.

Six days after the treacherous plunge of the German army into the Soviet Union we signalized that epochal turn in world history as changing the whole face and character of the European war, breaking through the last limitation within the boundaries of Europe and Asia, transforming the war into a gigantic universal conflict in which the national existence of all nations was placed at stake for military decision, and placing the United States of America in immediate and gravest military danger. It was recognized as a matter of coldest realism that the removal by Hitler of the obstacle of the great Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as the only remaining great power

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Europe, from his Eastern border (and that fantastic task is envisaged in his plan and is made the objective of the most colossal military drive of all history) would remove every obstacle to a concentration of the entire military equipment and resources of all Europe and Asia, at the disposal of the Axis powers. This concentration would bring the occupation of Great Britain and Ireland into the field of practical problems; it would serve to open both China and India to the Axis armies; it would place the acquired navies of all Europe and Asia, together with all of the shipbuilding and armament resources of the whole world, at the disposal of the Axis for convoys that would be easily protected by overwhelming Axis naval superiority in both the Atlantic and the Pacific, with an open road through Africa to the Western Hemisphere.

Despite all the criticism that was heaped upon our party for this estimate, it is now the accepted view of the American people and of every sober-minded patriot of every country in the world.

In fairness it must be said that from the first day of the involvement of the Soviet Union in the war, the most responsible spokesmen for the governments of the United States and Great Britain, and especially those responsible men charged with the realistic details of naval and military defense, to a large degree recognized that the transformation of the last neutral great power of Europe into a belligerent power removed the last possibility that the war might be limited to a part of the world. The changing of six thousand miles of neutral Soviet territory that lay between the war in Europe and the Pacific Ocean and Alaskan coast of the United States into belligerent territory soon compelled the most conservative minds to see that the die was cast. All are now compelled to recognize that the German Nazi state together with its vassal states has crossed the Rubicon into a struggle for world domination, and that America and Great Britain, side by side with the Soviet Union, are placed before the choice of destroying the German Nazi state or being destroyed.

In the logic of its national interest, and solely on the basis of its national interest, the foreign policy of the United States has become the policy of avoiding isolation and acquiring the greatest possible collective strength in the only way it can be acquired, through a coalition with the other powers that can give strength to the common cause. At the same time, the foreign policy of our government has ceased to be a policy imposed upon a divided nation by official circles from above: it has to a decisive degree been transformed from one that was opposed or suspected by the vast majority of the people into a policy recognized by the American people as their own, as a national defense necessary to the survival of our American nation.

The coalition of the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union is growing stronger. The Atlantic Conference in August dramatized the adoption by the United States

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Great Britain of a definite course in accord with the national interest of these countries, with a casting overboard of the Munich policy. The Moscow conference and the extension of the Lend-Lease measure to the Soviet Union gave reality to the Atlantic Conference. . . . The coalition of democratic nations against Hitler has been formed. It is taking material shape, not only in a beginning of serious activity of the Navy and in military preparations, but also in a growing stream of war supplies from the giant factories of America and those of England to the biggest battle line in Soviet Russia. . . .

The trend is for all of the twenty Latin American Republics to enter the united front of peoples against Nazi enslavement. The unanimous action of the Latin American Confederation of Labor in its congress at Mexico City is a powerful stimulant to a democratic course on the part of those nations, and to the solidarity of all the twenty Latin American nations in their common national interest. Events in Chile, Mexico, Cuba and other Latin American countries would give assurance, if assurance were needed, that the Latin American nations generally will act in accord with the interests of their national independence in keeping with their great traditions. The promise of effective Hemisphere defense is strengthened by the economic agreement between Mexico and the United States. The occupation of Dutch Guiana by the United States armed forces in collaboration with Brazil and Venezuela tends to give the necessary material form to the promise of Hemisphere defense.

The United States armed forces are being strengthened, although not by any means as rapidly or as greatly as they should be. An important positive improvement is the expansion of military and naval positions, as in the case of the occupation of Iceland with the agreement of the Icelandic people, and the incorporation of the Philippine army into the United States Army by agreement with the Philippine government and in accord with the united will of the Philippine people.

Our own American production of arms, ships and aircraft has been expanded rapidly and materially, although far short of the enormous possibilities that can and must be realized in the immediate future. Several of the main tasks which we shall enumerate center upon this question of production. Much cause for complaint, from the point of view of quick and effective armament help to other nations fighting Hitler, is to be found and overcome. However, American aid in the form of giant planes and tanks from American factories has begun to flow across the Atlantic to the Soviet Union, and aid to Great Britain has simultaneously increased; and we can proudly say that the glorious United States Navy, released at last from the chains of an appeasement policy, is seeing to it that these supplies reach the fighting line and are not sunk in the waters of the Atlantic.

It is possible to signalize at this meeting of our committee the decisive alignment of our country in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the world struggle in defense of the freedom of all peoples against the projected universal enslavement of nations.

The question immediately arises in the minds of all of us: Does that mean that the danger to this country's national existence is past? The answer is an emphatic *no!* the danger nevertheless has increased. . . .

Concentration and the Western Front

We must understand that the German freedom of concentration on the one front which is the Soviet Union front is not simply and solely a matter of special danger to the Soviet Union. We shall understand this if we make use of the main thought of our manifesto of five months ago, which is also the main thought of our approach and the approach of all intelligent mankind to this question; that approach is, that this is *one war and only one war,* on all of its fronts over the entire surface of every continent and every ocean. The German concentration on this single sector of the world front is a danger to all of the countries involved; a defeat of the Soviet Union would be a defeat equally for all. In this sense the German concentration on the Soviet front is a concentration against England and the United States as well.

What is necessary is to *break up that concentration,* to force Germany to divide her forces, and thereby improve the possibilities of defeating Germany. . . .

There has developed the situation in the Far East where to all appearances an open military and naval conflict is in the course of preparation. We have this morning the declaration from Tokio that the movement of the Japanese military forces into Thailand is only a movement in self-defense of the Japanese against "Chinese imperialist aggression." But our opinion is rather that the inevitable logic of this war—seen as one conflict—is bringing about a rapid development in the Far East, looking to the attempted seizures that were predicted by Secretary of War Stimson last August of the tin and oil and other supplies of the Malay and Dutch East Indies countries. We see that conflict developing according to an inexorable logic. We do not describe the situation as some of the newspapers do this morning, as creating a "risk of war." Don't let them play upon the most insidious pacifist illusion that we are in "danger" of war in the Far East. If a goon batters you up, you don't say that you can't defend yourself for fear of getting into a fight.

The fight has begun, the fight exists, the war is already in full effect in every real sense. [*Editor's note:* This speech was made more than twenty-four hours before the attack on Pearl Harbor.] And the danger is that the United States will be too slow, that its self-defense in coalition with all other nations that can contribute to our collective strength will be too far behind. The danger is that we will play with illusions, and that the aggression against the United States, the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soviet Union, Great Britain and the Far East will reach an extremely disadvantageous situation before full action is taken.

And so we must admit that with all the successes that our country has undoubtedly attained in the way of national unity, the tremendous danger nevertheless exists that the consolidation of national unity around the American Government, around America's foreign policy, will be too slow, that there will be an insufficient boldness in unfolding that foreign policy which is not now just a government policy but the policy of the people of America. The danger is that we have allowed our country relatively to lag behind into a relationship of forces that is even more dangerous than it was five months ago when we only dared to dream and hope for the collective defense of the world from Nazi conquest, and dared to hope that it might take the form of the defense of our country's national interest collectively with Great Britain and the Soviet Union in the form of a coalition. . . .

What must the United States do as a result of the increasing danger? Obviously our country must play a more active role, and very quickly, in the world-wide struggle that threatens to rise above the level of our own preparation and activity. Obviously the necessary division of Hitler's concentration on a single front requires a far more comprehensive plan and action than what we have put into operation. Obviously it is necessary now for the U.S. to follow the example of England by withdrawing the diplomatic shelter that we are now giving to a whole nest of criminal sabotage agents of the satellites of the Axis powers. It is necessary to strengthen the coalition of those powers which must coalesce their efforts if there is to be maximum strength. This necessarily takes the form of the making and faithful execution of military agreements. Fulfilment of the Moscow agreement must be without faltering or half-heartedness, and the political alertness of the whole American people must be aroused to see that fulfilment takes place. It is inescapable, also, that the United States proceed now resolutely to prevent the encirclement of the Philippines, the seizure of the world's tin and rubber supplies, which have become absolutely indispensable to modern war, and which are necessary for an effective struggle for victory. . . .

On the Military Situation

Most important results have been obtained by the Red Army and Navy. The superiority in morale of the Soviet fighting men has become itself a colossal force, enabling it to make successes that defied all calculation, against heavy technical odds. The spirit of the Red Army has passed from the battlefields of the Soviet Union into the occupied countries of Europe, destroying the myth of German invincibility and rekindling the fires of willingness to fight the invader. It has dampened the gangster-morale of the Nazi horde.

The Red Army has delivered an irreparable blow to the German

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Army. Secondly, it has itself laid waste its own territory temporarily lost to the enemy. Thirdly, the Red Army has by skill and good generalship succeeded in preserving itself intact in spite of all odds and despite the highly developed technique of spearhead break-throughs, some of which are practically inevitable at the hands of an enemy holding superiority in tanks. . . .

Napoleon Bonaparte some hundred and thirty years ago boasted to the Austrian Prince Metternich, "I can use up 25,000 men a month."

That boast of the lion Napoleon passed for a hundred years as the extreme example of the heartless cruelty of military conquerors: to use up 25,000 men a month. It was through such expenditure of the blood of France that the French conqueror came to his end. But now let us compare that estimate and boast of Napoleon to the number of German men "used up" by the diseased housecat Hitler, which he does not boast of, but rather tries to conceal from the German people. In the first four months of the attack on the Soviet Union the German army lost men at the rate of 1,125,000 men per month—just forty-five times as many as the boast of Napoleon. In this one respect the kitten has exceeded the lion.

In the truest sense of the word the German armed forces have failed in their objective in the U.S.S.R.

It is necessary for us to clear our minds and understand the modern conception of what the objectives are in war. It has always been commonplace to military men that the objective of war is not the occupation of territory but the *destruction of the army of the enemy.* This has been somewhat obscured recently, due partly to the fact that the operations of the huge German armies in very small territories like Holland and Belgium, with quick-moving motorized columns, made the destruction of the opposing army and the occupation of the territory practically one and the same act.

But the vastness of the space of the U.S.S.R. and the skilled strategy of the Red Army have tended to restore the difference between occupying the territory and defeating an army.

Now in the most realistic way it is brought forward that not the temporary loss of territory but the preservation of the Red Army intact is what matters; and the inflicting of irreplaceable losses upon the German army has proved to be the only correct means of fighting that campaign. Stalin, in his work *Leninism,* calls attention to the fact that one of the favorable internal features which facilitated the victory of the Soviet Power in 1917 and subsequent years was precisely that the new Soviet state had at its disposal the extensive area of Russia. Lenin spoke of this factor, calling our attention to the fact that military science treats the utilization of it as the most orthodox of methods. He said: "Whoever regards this as an artificial formula, made up to suit the needs of the moment, is advised to read old Clausewitz."

The strategic, well-timed withdrawal of the Red Army in good

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

order, while stubbornly exacting heavy losses of the enemy, was a success requiring the highest military skill and morale. I want to make clear one point: It is particularly important to see today during the brilliant military action at Rostov that the retreat was the means of preserving the initiative of the Soviet Army despite the fact of the several times greater number of powerful weapons, of tanks in possession of the enemy. By that policy the Red Army retained the initiative that is now enabling it to drive Von Kleist rapidly toward the borders of Germany. This tactic has compelled the German commanders to carry out a policy they *do not wish to carry out—i.e.,* instead of making their objective the one and only sound military objective, the destruction of the Red Army, they had to miss that aim and were compelled to give their strength to the occupation of territory so vast that, in the face of the morale of the Soviet people and army, it cannot be occupied under those circumstances, without tremendous and irreplaceable losses at the hands of the Red Army.

This is not the realization of the objective of Hitler's attempted "lightning" war in the Soviet Union. The German fascists miscalculated.

* * *

But it would be a big mistake if we, in turn, were to miscalculate by underestimating the extremely grave danger that has been increased by the advance of the German armies in the Soviet Union, and also by other events, taken as a whole.

Why have the Germans been able to advance? The answer is a very important one for American workers. Stalin said on November 6 that "the secret of the temporary successes of the German army" lies in the fact that the Soviet Army has "several times fewer tanks than the Germans," and that "the Germans are producing a far greater number of tanks because they now have at their disposal not only their own tank industry but also the industry of Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Holland and France."

The calculations of every major advance include the assumption that they will use up hundreds and thousands of tons of military equipment. The tanks, airplanes, guns and shells that are destroyed at the front every day have to be replaced by factory production. Where do these goods come from? They can only come from gigantic modern factories. A battle is therefore not merely a fight on a front. A battle is a huge torrent of hundreds of thousands of tons of steel and powder and steel products pouring from the mines to the factories, through the factories and the assembly line onto the railroads and to the front; and modern warfare consists in hurling these millions of tons of factory products at the enemy.

As Stalin said, the German Army "never goes into battle without tanks and cannot withstand the blows" of the Red Army units, "unless it has superiority in tanks." This is a subject for thought for every American.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Battle for Production

We must have no illusions that the role of our country can be confined to that of an "arsenal of democracy," *i.e.*, the making of war materials solely for others to use. If we were to conceive of the role of the United States in this war in the language of the Hearst press as the role of "helping Russia and Britain," we might dream that merely the role of supplying factory products was enough. Since we know that not the interest of some other country, but the national interest of the United States is the motive of the United States Government entering this war, we immediately see that not only the economic but also the military strength, and the full belligerent use of its military and naval strength can permit the effective functioning of the United States in this war.

Nevertheless, the production of machinery of war has to be seen in this light—that the United States is the only source on earth from which these instruments of war, which can be produced only in the most advanced gigantic mass industry, can go to the front to supplement the supplies of Great Britain and the Soviet Union, which are competing against the armament works of all six of the greatest machine-producing and armament plants in the whole world, that are now at the disposal of the German army.

Consequently, our American trade unions, especially those in the big factories, have tremendous duties in keeping production going and preventing sabotage of the process of making those war materials.

In Great Britain we see a development of an extremely interesting sort, a peculiar example of the conjuncture of history that has made necessary the national unity to win the war. The inevitable and spontaneous trend toward solidarity of British workers with their brothers of the Soviet Union is being disclosed as a necessary factor in defense of England. Lord Beaverbrook's very eloquent words to the British workers on October 12 were not accidental.

". . . we have pledged your faith," he said to the British workers, "the faith of the workingmen and women of Britain and of the New World as well; we have spoken the words but you must do the deeds. You, the workers of Britain and of the United States as well, men and women alike, you are all pledged to uphold the standards of Russia on the battlefront where the Germans seek to destroy. You take your part, your splendid share in the defense of Leningrad, at the outposts of Moscow, at the citadel of Odessa. . . . Stalin puts his faith in our pledges. He believes we speak truly on your behalf. Stalin must be sustained. The Soviet Union must be enabled to enter the spring campaign with adequate supplies of all munitions of war—over everything tanks, anti-tank guns, aircraft and anti-aircraft guns. These are the promises made to Stalin in Moscow in your name. These are the pledges we shall carry out."

We call to mind that that is the voice of a united people and gov-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ernment of Great Britain. That voice arises out of the necessity, the imperative need for British national unity in order that the national existence of that nation shall not be destroyed. Herein is instanced the terrific power, the dynamic strength of the forces whereby the national interests of these countries merge into a certain confluence with the interests of labor internationally in the common national defense.

Here, in our own country, President Roosevelt, in his recent address to the International Labor Organization conference, put forward a formula, which is an acceptable and accepted basis, at least in theory, on which the trade union movement can collaborate with the industrial managers and owners in production for war. These are President Roosevelt's words:

". . . realism in terms of three shifts a day, the fullest use of every vital machine, every minute of every day and every night; realism in terms of staying on the job and getting things made, and entrusting industrial grievances to the established machinery of collective bargaining—the machinery set up by a free people."

That is not to be regarded as a program that labor has to be persuaded to accept, that is not even a concession to capital. That can be called, not a concession, but a demand of labor. Labor demands precisely the full functioning of industry now to assure the highest development of war technique, of equipment of the United States Army and Navy and that of England and of the Soviet Union to the full; to out-equip the whole world against Hitler.

President William Green of the American Federation of Labor has said: "Every member and every union in the American Federation of Labor should stay on the job and keep defense production going at full blast until the enemies of America are soundly defeated." And Philip Murray, president of the C.I.O., has spoken similary. We can say that the job now is no longer words but action.

To promote the national unity by the greatest initiative of the masses, we must arouse the people. The 11,000,000 members of the trade unions, together with their families, constitute approximately one-third of the nation's population. The activization of this enormous and essentially homogeneous mass, because it is an organized mass and because its interests are the same, would in itself be decisive for success in civilian defense; in the sale of defense bonds; in the putting over of the production program, proper mobilization to aid the Soviet Union and Great Britain and China in all respects, and the proper political punch to break the jaw of the appeasement group. It could be a powerful force in support of the President and Congress in all legislation necessary for the successful prosecution of the war and in preventing the sabotage of the war, the weakening of the American war effort that is to be found in the anti-labor legislative proposals.

These matters should be discussed in every trade union hall, in every trade union newspaper; cooperation

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must be asked and obtained between the workers' organizations, the farmers' organizations, with the American Legion, with the youth organizations, Negro groups, business groups and women's groups.

In order that we make quite sure that the national cause is not the monopoly of a class, let me cite an expression of William S. Knudsen, Director General of the O.P.M., who said day before yesterday: "We know we can't win without the support of labor." That is true. We want to take it up and make it ours, and we add to it this: "Labor can't win *anything* without beating Hitler." If we are to raise production to unprecedented levels in order to guarantee success of our arms against the German axis, that would not be a concession of labor to capital but a demand realized by labor. It is only in this sense of the higher interests of labor, synthesized with the national interest of the entire people, that we can understand the problem of production for war. We can understand it only by realizing the active role of labor at this time. This is necessary in the interests of labor, and this active initiative on the part of labor can be realized only by organized labor exercising its initiative collectively: that is indispensable for the collective military defense of any *modern* democracy.

Mr. Knudsen says on the subject of strike legislation: "With our home on fire, we can't have a strike in the fire department." Well, we agree that there must not be stoppages. War production must go on. Then we add: "Yes, and with our house on fire, we cannot have the fire department locked up in jail." And then we make the point: "What house is on fire?" It is our house that is on fire; it is the firemen's house that is on fire. The interest of labor is indeed to march ahead and to extinguish the fire, and we cede to nobody in our vital concern for that.

But it is necessary here to make a sharp comment on people who have been talking about the matter of promoting production and the question of sacrifices. We are obliged to remind the world now that American labor would sacrifice as willingly and as completely as Spanish labor sacrificed when it was necessary, when Spanish workers stood and starved at the bench to produce. But at the same time we are Marxists and we approach this thing is a Marxian way, not with any blanket slogans about sacrifice, which would give into the hands of those who want to make this an occasion not for war production but for unlimited profits, a weapon to use against real production which has to be carried on in an American way. We have to bear in mind that the American form of production is a form of production of a very highly developed technical sort, involving very great intensity of labor, where the stop-watch and every spare second of relaxation has been squeezed out of the labor process, where the intensity of labor has been brought up to the highest point, coincident with the greatest productivity of labor that has ever been attained in the history of the world. The workers in the great

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ford and General Motors plants can testify to the fact that the shorter hours that have been attained, the standards of living that have been gained, have in general been necessary features to make it possible for them to keep up with that intense strain, where the last split second has been calculated.

We are obliged to recognize that efficient production in American industry under these modern conditions requires for its best functioning a standard of wages and living which includes a meat and butter diet that is unknown in any nation of Europe except insofar as the Soviet Union is realizing it. The building up of the capacity of workers to maintain this high productivity of labor is necessary for American production. Therefore we make no concessions to those who raise Goering slogans of "Not butter but cannon." We say: "Butter for the sake of cannon." We reject the idea of wholesale sacrifice slogans, that the standard of living should be brought down in all of industry. What is necessary is effective production and in many cases it requires, not leveling downward, but leveling upward of the standards of wages and living. In many cases we find that the fall in real wages that has resulted from price inflation has been such as to make necessary an adjustment upward of money wages. The recent increase in the wages of the railroad workers has been a small, a quite incomplete restoration of what has been lost by inflation of prices.

We must call these things to mind so that questions of production may be approached from the point of view of what country we are dealing with, what the conditions are, and not under some abstract formula. And the conclusion is that the way to get American industry producing on the highest levels is not by any loose and general slogans for a lowering of the standard of living, but by recognizing the conditions of American life, the enormous food resources—even surpluses of farm products—the special intensity of labor made practical by certain levels of living standards. We can obtain no good results from general assaults on the standards of living of labor, or reckless general application of blanket slogans about sacrifices which will only play into the hands of labor haters whose objective is not to produce for war but to bleed the country for extreme profits and to attack the trade unions in the hope of destroying them while the excuse of war-need is available.

National Unity and the Enemies of National Unity

We have said that the foreign policy of the United States government has the support of the American people, and that the people—all the learned editorials to the contrary—have instinctively understood that a change has occurred which has transformed the war they opposed into a war which they know is now a necessary and just war of national defense of our country. I said that the foreign policy of the Government has become the policy of the American people in the main,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and that it has become so in the last four or five months. Only six months ago it was customary to speak of going into the war with a "divided people." It is significant that in the past several months even the appeasement press has stopped speaking of the American people as "divided."

Certainly, there are dangerous and powerful appeasement groups, tremendous organizations with wide ramifications, creating an extraordinary danger to American safety and national defense. There is a strong and very dangerous fifth column in the United States. . . .

Nevertheless, it is true that in spite of all that can be done by these unscrupulous and powerful influences, the people are in the main not divided. . . .

The American Legion convention a few days ago was an important test in this respect. The Legion took a stand which we ought to study from the point of view of the tremendous possibilities and powerful sweep of the national unity based on the national interest. Unhesitatingly, the American Legion rejected the proposal of the appeasement group to weaken the United States by rejecting collaboration with the Soviet Union. On the contrary, the Legion came out forcefully for the only possible successful national defense, which is through the world-wide front which includes the U.S.S.R. The position of the American Legion contributes to the firm foundation of national unity. We can agree fully with the Legion convention's reaffirmation of its position as regards conscription. Secretary of the Navy Knox described the position of the Legion in these words, "for a national military system based on universal military obligation . . . a policy of universal military training so that an American citizen, when called upon to discharge this primary function of citizenship, shall be trained and equipped to meet successfully and victoriously the hazards of war." It is necessary now as never before to reaffirm the classic position of the Communist Party. What is our position? Our position has always been in favor of universal military training and always we have regarded a system of universal obligation of military service as the most democratic system, quite necessary when wars are inevitable. We opposed the Burke-Wadsworth Bill under the conditions of the time it was proposed, and we were correct in opposing it then. But our opposition to it was an opposition to a step which at that time was an inseparable part of an imperialistic war policy. Our opposition to the Burke-Wadsworth Bill was never an opposition in principle to universal compulsory military training and obligatory service. Let me sharply emphasize that the present situation in the United States brings together in support of a common policy of national defense widely divergent organizations, including, in the first place, the great American labor movement as a whole, and, in the second place, such organizations as the American Legion, the churches, all political parties that are not subverted by alien influences, and all other organizations

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that have their roots among the people.

It is noteworthy that the Protestant Churches almost without important exceptions are supporters of the national unity of our country and the foreign policy of the government in its defense. This was dramatized by the fact that the great Cathedral of St. John the Divine—the largest and newest religious temple in New York, with the wealthiest congregation in the whole world—on the occasion of the full opening of the Cathedral as its very first act instituted prayers for the success of the Soviet Red Army, together with the army of Great Britain and the other countries fighting Hitler. Let there be no misunderstanding as to why this was done. It was done in consideration of the national interest of the United States, and for no other reason. . . .

The Labor Movement

Last but not least, the labor movement. . . .

Those who imagine that the trade unions need only play a passive role in the struggle for national defense are committing the worst opportunist folly, which could condemn the national defense to impotence and ruin. Under the modern conditions in which the present world-wide war of national defense occurs, tremendous duties fall on the organized labor movement, and these duties include a united initiative on the part of organized labor greater than any that has ever been attained heretofore.

Those who are now arguing for a limitation of the role of the trade unions in industry, advocating the breaking down of the unions, on the ground that this weakening of the unions is a sacrifice necessary for the national defense, are offering a program of disaster to the nation and not just to labor; because under modern conditions and particularly the conditions of this war there can be no successful defense of the national existence and independence of the nation without a powerful organized labor movement as a decisive factor, not only in industry but politically, in the national front.

The C.I.O. convention was a crossroad of history, and not alone for the whole labor movement. It was a crucial test of the vitality of the democratic forces of this country, and therefore of the capacity of the United States to assume its role in the given international situation. It was a test in fact, not alone of the democracy, but of the vitality of the national life of the country. That convention was an important testing ground on which again the historic mission of the working class was challenged by its enemies and in an immediately effective degree was answered. . . .

The C.I.O. convention was a victory for the workers that can never be forgotten. Its colossal effects are perhaps not yet fully realized. I want to say emphatically that if the objectives of the appeasement forces that made use of Lewis had been attained—it would have been a historic monstrosity of incalculable effect not only upon the American Labor movement but upon the en-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tire national situation and the world-wide struggle. The C.I.O. represents the basic sections of workers, who play the more decisive role in the heavy and mass-production industries, whose organization, at last, and belatedly, during the past decade, marked an important change, a historic change, in the relation of social forces in American national life.

We can say with calm assurance, now, that the perversion of that convention to the purposes of the appeasers could not happen; that it would have been out of accord with the laws of motion of society, contrary to the historic role of the working class and particularly of the basic section of the workers. That great fact is made up of human action; its "anatomy" is composed of men, together with their political understanding. The development of the political maturity of these men and women, to catch up with their sudden maturity of organization, is decisive. For this reason it is necessary for us to say that every current mistaken habit of mind remaining among the working class as a residue of its past immaturity has become a serious danger that must be combatted and rooted out. Reaction cultivates and uses these illusions.

For instance, it is obvious that the slogan of "No A.E.F.," raised in the U.A.W. convention in Buffalo, opposing the use of an American expeditionary force, even in a just cause, is based upon primitive pacifist illusions, a petty-bourgeois misconception of the nature of war, contrary to the experience of the working class that sent its own members to help Loyalist Spain with arms in hand. That slogan is possible only against a background of primitive narrowness that fails to see the international character of the struggle and this is foreign to the instinct of international solidarity of the working class. The Buffalo resolution, containing the "No A.E.F." slogan, became momentarily the basis on which the Lewis forces attempted a "compromise" stratagem to maneuver the C.I.O. convention into opposition to the foreign policy of Roosevelt, simply because "No A.E.F." is a sufficient basis for giving a completely free hand to Hitler as far as the United States is concerned.

If we seek out our own weaknesses that may have tended to leave a gap in the line, we may find that we ourselves—the party whose role it is to dispell such illusions—were slow in overcoming the effects of the influence of pacifist elements with which in the past we were rightly compelled to associate to a degree. Pacifism, always a trend contrary to the interests of the working class, and completely foreign to its ideology, has under the new situation become one of the most dangerous weapons of reaction, a stiletto in the hand of the worst of the imperialist forces, of the appeasers who seek to aid the plans of the German fascist invaders. Pacifism functions as a germ of paralysis within the democratic ranks; when the political struggle reaches the degree of intensity where resort is made to military instruments, the role of pacifism is to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

choose that moment to break the ranks of the democratic forces, to bring retreat, defeat and surrender of the struggle.

I think we must criticize ourselves for not having done enough to clarify the nature of the war as being no more than the continuation of the political struggle by other (*i.e.* forceful) means; an understanding which makes it possible for all workers to see the necessity of continuing the struggle through the military stage, as the only alternative to surrender and enslavement. . . .

The most important weakness in labor is the absence of trade union unity. The lack of unity robs labor of the full strength and authority that would facilitate the defeat of legislative attempts to hamstring the labor movement. Lack of trade union unity is an incentive to employers to utilize every difference in labor's ranks. It promotes jurisdictional struggles that are utterly sterile of any good to labor, and all the more dangerous to production because of their utter lack of any basis in the interest of the workers.

To the situation today can be applied something that our beloved leader Earl Browder said many months ago. I quote:

"We declare that unity of labor, unity of the working class, unity of the trade union movement, must be the backbone of any really effective unity of the people. Workers of the A. F. of L. and C.I.O., who agree in the great majority on all the most crucial issues of the day, must find the way to act together as they already think together, to defeat all enemies of unity, and to make labor a great power in the life of the country, above all, in these days of danger and emergency."

In the process of the struggle for general trade union unity it is possible to have unity of action in the factories and in every locality. There is already beginning a working unity of action against anti-strike legislation. There should be unity of labor to support the call of President Murray of the C.I.O. for a conference of labor, government and industry on the question of war production.

* * *

I cannot go further without calling to mind the very sharp bringing forward of the struggle of the American Negroes that has occurred as a result of the war situation. Is it not rather a strange thought to speak of the unity of a nation that is cut through to the very heart with the ugly wound of race division, a division based on the remainders of human slavery and kept alive at times by public murders and burnings of human beings, by the filthy practice of Jim Crowism?

Can we speak of the unity of the nation thus divided? Yes, we can. But we can understand and make useful the proper conception of unity only with a Communist approach, a Marxist-Leninist approach, only if we face the problem of the Negro in the war situation with the Marxist system of thinking and acting. We know that the na-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional question of the Negro people will make its best progress in the confluence of the great historic currents that are running strong in these times. It is worthwhile to recall that the Emancipation Proclamation was issued, not as a humanitarian gift to the Negroes, but as a war measure to weaken the enemy and to strengthen the military position of the United States; and it came in a certain relationship to the beginning of incorporation of Negro troops into the army, as a necessity to strengthen the hand of the United States Government against the threat of military destruction. There were plenty of people who then said, "Well, the Negroes have so many grievances that they should not be bothered about the war. They are segregated in the army and cruelly sacrificed in military tactics." But the Negro people, under the leadership of Frederick Douglass, made the defeat of the slave power the center of their strategy, in spite of the fact that Lincoln himself declared that the aim of the war was not the abolition of slavery. Douglass knew that not Lincoln but the hard historic necessity of national interest would determine the course. . . .

The only course that is to the benefit of the Negro people is the course of entering the war effort fully, completely, making it *their* war effort, making their demands for unity in the war effort, making their demands in the first place against these measures of brutality, of the Jim-Crow system, that prevent their participation in the war effort. . . .

The Communist Party

I come now to the closing section of the report—about the party.

One of the greatest honors to the Communist Party of the U.S.A. is the fact that the General Secretary of our party, Comrade Earl Browder, is known and respected in Latin America for his consistent championing of the cause of the Republics of Latin America in their struggle for preservation of their independence and integrity against all encroachments from every source, including sources in our own country.

It is an honor, not alone to Comrade Browder, but also to the party that he leads, that the Latin American countries have found reason to respect him and to respect our party because of its course that is due mainly to his guidance, in our careful, alert attention to the very dangerous imperialist menaces to the Latin American people. The truest test of the anti-imperialist integrity and honor of a Communist Party in a large and powerful country is its retaining the respect of those peoples toward whom the great power assumes in general or at any time the role of exploiter. It is our determination that, although deprived of Browder, we will go through this crisis of war and menace to the national independence of all peoples with the honor of having remained loyal to the international cause, and especially alert to the cause of the peoples of Latin America.

We cannot presume to tell our Latin American comrades what

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they are to do in this war crisis. We can but say that there is absolutely evident an assault on the Latin American countries, to make of that thinly populated and enormously wealthy continent a colonial realm of fascist domination.

These countries are without the big industries necessary to equip their fighting forces with the modern weapons that can make them most effective. Their defense must be made with their own strength, their own people and under their own command, based, as the Communist Parties of these countries are making clear now, upon universal military training, universal military service on the most democratic basis. The Lend-Lease extension to Latin America for the building up of their defenses must be on a basis favorable to those countries, always respecting their integrity, realizing that they must at all times be in control of their own countries and all of their instruments of defense.

* * *

At this time of world struggle we emphasize internationalism, which more than ever is important to the welfare of all the nations, and which is inseparable from the heart and life of the labor movement. This internationalism of labor, far from being inconsistent with the struggle for national liberation, is an absolutely necessary and powerful help to that national struggle.

We extend the hand of international working class solidarity to our brother workers and the Communist Parties in Spain and France, and the other occupied countries, to the Communist Party of Germany and its great leader Ernst Thaelmann, who is locked in a German prison. We hold out our hand of solidarity to our brother workers and the Communist Party of China, to the workers and the Communist Party of Great Britain, and not least of all to the workers and their great Communist Party of the U.S.S.R., headed by the great leader in the cause of progressive mankind, Comrade Stalin.

* * *

Sectarian attitudes arise out of every sudden turn of history. Only those who are without the weapon of Communist understanding can be confused in the present situation by the association of the term "national defense" with the despicable course of those so-called Socialists who betrayed the cause of labor by serving the imperialist warmakers in the name of "national defense" in the imperialist world war of 1914. We speak boldly and freely and clearly of the *imperialist side* of the war and of imperialism in action in the drive for world conquest by the Axis powers headed by Nazi Germany, and our knowledge of Marxism-Leninism as a guide to action and not a dogma guards us against the provocations of the various fifth-column groups who seek to confuse and divide the workers by reciting the imperialist qualities of the United States and Great Britain. It is we, the Communists, who have always opposed and fought the chauvinist supporters of imperialist war, supporters of *their "own"* im-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perialist states in imperialist aggression. Because we are Communists we cannot be deceived by sectarian songs when these powers function as active enemies of the existing and present imperialist menace to the world. As Communists we understand what we do. Communists have no secrets from the people. There are no skeletons in our closets, we explain clearly to every worker the full meaning of the course we follow.

Distorted and sectarian versions of our party theory have been hurled at us in reproach. The Communist Party on the basis of the character of this war has pursued a correct main line.

In the words of Lenin:

". . . the role of vanguard can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by advanced theory."

It was in accord with our principles when we called for and participated in the "defense of the fatherland" in the case of the Spanish Republic; and we then called for the United States and Great Britain to join with Spain to smash and destroy the Hitler monster, as we had called before for them to do in the case of Ethiopia; and we would have joyfully supported these great powers in such a just war, had it been possible to persuade them to enter it then. . . . We follow those principles, and the fact that the workers' movement possesses this treasury of principles will turn the scales in favor of national unity, the successful defense of our country, and the doom of Hitler. . . .

The Communist Party has been under persecution and attack. . . . To some extent the party is still under these attacks. The winning of the fight for national unity requires that we effectively combat reactionary movements such as prosecutions and similar actions representing the view of those who wish to return us to feudal methods, to abolish Constitutional guarantees, etc. The aim of all such reactionary attacks is ultimately the suppression of the labor movement, beginning with the Communist Party and coming inevitably to the banning of trade union activities. Already we see evidence of this in anti-strike laws, etc. It is obvious that the defense of the democratic core of our country requires that we shall defend the party and the labor movement against such attacks.

The struggle for the release of Earl Browder has to be seen partly in this connection.

First, however, and regardless of that connection, the entire party does and must demand the restoration of its beloved leader because his great wisdom, his lion-hearted courage, and his skill as a leader and organizer are the greatest single treasure we possess. But, in the spirit of all that we have learned by working at his side all of these years, we strive to infuse the masses as well with that demand. We need and demand his restoration to his post as the guide of the party—and more, as the strongest tribune of the people that the American labor movement has produced. We required him and had a right to him, in his post beside his life-long col-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

laborator, his great teacher and friend, Comrade Foster—during this terrific half-year, the most crucial time and the severest test that our party has ever known. We who have worked with Comrade Browder during a full score of years—or as in the case of Comrade Foster, thirty years—have tried to do our best to guide the party as Browder would have guided it in this greatest of all turning points. I have no doubt that we have fallen short of what we would have attained with him at the helm; doubtless we have been slower than we would have been with his quick mind and unifying spirit among us.

But I say we have tried to do as we would have done with his guidance. He cannot speak here. But out of the almost complete silence of his imprisonment we have reason to discern that he believes that we have done well on the whole. If we have, it is to a large degree because he left us an arsenal of knowledge, the product of experience under his leadership, stored up, upon which we could draw.

We have tried to preserve the unity of the party and its leadership, a unity which the Party had never acquired until Browder came to the general secretaryship and formed the center around which that unity could be formed. But remember this always: The foundation stone of unity of a Communist Party is the correct line of the party. There never was and never could be unity without correctness of line. . . .

And if we have preserved unity, and if we wish to preserve unity, we must see to it that the course of mass work is correct. I think I can repeat with full endorsement the words of a comrade of the leadership: "At the last plenum we were confronted with a world-shaking event, and had to view everythng with new glasses. And we not only held the party to a correct course, but we have been able to help shape events. This plenum faces a developed situation that has brought new and great tasks. With greater clarity, greater energy, inspired by Browder, we will perform them."

Comrades, our party, the party for which we live and would willingly die, is at the crossroads of the highest moment of its life. A century to come, and in a better time, men and women will look back and speak of the way that we conducted our work in this time.

Let us be worthy of this moment, of this party, of this country, and of our great Comrade Browder.

Let us give everything to the titanic political struggle which has reached that ferocity in which polemics come from the mouths of cannon.

Let us assure that the full might of this mighty country is put into the task of crushing Nazi slavery. *Everything for victory!*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TRADE UNIONS IN THE WAR EMERGENCY

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

The Basis Role of the Trade Unions in American National Unity

NAZI Germany can be defeated only by a united American people, fighting jointly with Great Britain, the U.S.S.R., China and other anti-Hitler peoples. All the classes in the United States—capitalists, farmers, city middle classes, workers—have a common and most urgent need to stand together in national unity to smash the Hitler threat to our national independence, civil liberties and economic welfare.

The labor movement must form the very backbone of this national unity, of the fight of our nation against Nazi Germany and its aides. The three great divisions of the trade unions—the C.I.O., the A. F. of L. and the Railroad Brotherhoods—with their 11,000,000 members and their families, and with their huge following among the unorganized workers, constitute a vital and enormous mass of the American people. They are also the most democratic section of our nation; they have the most to lose by a Hitler victory; they have the most to gain by a Hitler defeat.

The full and active participation of the trade unions in the national unity is indispensable for the success of the struggle against Nazi Germany; their powerful democratic influence is needed to stiffen up the Government's anti-Hitler war policies; their position in industry makes them a vital factor in winning the crucial battle for production; their mass influence is necessary for the maintenance of democracy in America, while the war against Hitler is going on.

To perform their basic role in building and strengthening national unity the trade unions must themselves be united. Only in this way can the organized workers exert effectively their tremendous constructive power in America's war effort. It would be a grave mistake for the trade unions to try to go through this war split as they are now. The form that trade union unity is taking is united action among the three big divisions of organized labor—the C.I.O., A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhoods—upon all war issues. Although the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. have many points of sharp conflict in the industries, and long experience in the A. F. of L. shows how difficult it is to heal such jurisdictional problems, nevertheless this is no reason why the two trade union centers cannot cooperate on ques-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions of national defense. In fact, they are already doing so in various localities.

United labor action upon questions of national defense is the central need of the American labor movement. To secure this trade union unity, as the basis for all-inclusive national unity, the trade unions must become vastly more active politically. The war situation is casting up a host of problems, all political in character. These problems relate to foreign policy, defense production, the financing of the war, the regulation of prices and profits, the protection of civil liberties, etc. Questions of wages, hours and working conditions are also becoming constantly more political in character and are increasingly the concern of the Government.

If organized labor is to play its proper part in the national unity it must meet all these questions in a united and political way. It must demand full representation on all the Government defense boards; it must insist upon its proper place in the President's Cabinet; it must take an active part in all elections. And, above all, organized labor must develop a united and rounded-out program to meet all phases of the present war emergency. During recent years American labor has grown up organizationally; now is must become adult politically.

To unify and develop labor's program there is urgent need for a national conference of the whole trade union movement. This conference would outline labor's attitude more clearly toward foreign policy and national unity; it could unify its at present uncoordinated plans for intensifying munitions production; it could organize labor's fight against the pro-Hitler fifth column; it could make real its demand for full political representation in the Government; it could soften many of the present conflicts between A. F. of L. and C.I.O. unions, and it would do much towards achieving eventual complete trade union unity. A general conference of all trade unions is not only basically necessary for national unity and the struggle against Hitler, but it would also constitute an enormous stride forward for the American labor movement.

President Murray of the C.I.O. has demanded that there be called a Government-industry-labor conference to work out a program to meet the war emergency, and President Green of the A. F. of L. has proposed a plan somewhat similar to the War Labor Board of World War I. It is probable that action along these lines will be taken by the Government, especially if the question is raised energetically throughout the whole labor movement. The necessary unification of labor's program, by a general conference of all three major groups, might readily be held preparatory to or in connection with such a national get-together of Government, labor and capital.

The Conventions of the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O.

During the past few weeks the two great national federations of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labor, each claiming some 5,000,000 members, have held their conventions. The C.I.O., which increased its membership by 900,000 in the past year, has become the most fundamental section and the leader of the labor movement. With its great unions in coal, steel, auto, electrical, manufacturing, etc., it is a decisive factor in the defense program. It also has generally the more progressive program and leadership, and its whole structure and system of work are in harmony with modern industrial and political conditions. This does not mean, however, that we should underestimate the great importance of the A. F. of L. Although resting principally upon the lighter industries and hampered by reactionary practices, the A. F. of L. contains many basic workers, such as the 850,000 railroad workers, 500,000 truck drivers, 250,000 machinists, 75,000 longshoremen, etc. Moreover, it is showing rapid growth (260,000 in the past year) and it has a distinct vitality. Neglect of the A. F. of L. is a most serious shortcoming in our trade union work.

The two conventions worked out policies making for an all-out struggle against Hitler. Both displayed strong progressive tendencies. They gave wholehearted support to the Government's anti-Hitler foreign policy. They pledged themselves to do everything possible to create a firm national unity. They also assumed a responsible attitude toward the battle for production and for the defense of the people's economic and political rights. In nearly all these matters the C.I.O., true to its more progressive character, spoke out the most clearly and decisively.

The great weakness of both conventions was that they did not take a more positive stand on the vital issue of united labor action upon defense issues, although in both conventions there was a greater spirit of unity and a keener appreciation of the need for political action. This unity spirit was shown by the fact that this year the federations were much less violent in their attacks upon each other than before. The C.I.O. also gave a striking demonstration of its unity spirit by endorsing the demands of the railroad workers. But what was lacking was a ringing insistence upon united labor action. This was a very grave weakness, which should be overcome in the near future. Nothing would give a stronger impetus to national unity and nothing could be more beneficial to the whole labor movement than the coming together of all sections of organized labor on the basis of a unified program to smash Hitler. The passage of the Smith Bill by the House should be replied to by the establishment of trade union unity, locally, statewide and nationally.

Such a unification of labor's forces politically would be enthusiastically welcomed by the rank and file of labor, by the Roosevelt Administration and by the whole American people. It would open the doors of the Cabinet and of all Government boards to labor. It would put a halt to the present dangerous attempt in Congress to shackle labor with anti-strike legislation. It

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would strengthen national unity in every direction.

Trade Union Tasks in Building National Unity

National unity comprises all elements in American life, without regard to class or party, who are willing to fight Hitler, including capitalists, small businessmen, farmers, professionals and workers—Democrats, Republicans, Farmer-Laborites, Socialists and Communists. The United States Government is its cutting edge. It is the whole American people in action against Hitler, and the trade unions must be its very heart.

A host of organizations and activities, many of them governmental or semi-governmental, are involved in the building and functioning of national unity, in all of which the trade unions must play their part. These relate to the active mobilization of the people in support of every phase of the fight in Congress and elsewhere for the development of the Government's anti-Hitler policy; the carrying out of the program for winning the battle for production; the development of an active political defense of the people's economic and political rights; the creation of a whole network of committees and activities in connection with the United Service Organizations and civilian defense; active collaboration with all anti-Hitler elements in city and state elections; organized participation in the financing of the war through the sale of bonds, etc.; the building of a big movement for Russian War Relief; a great intensification of the campaign to free Earl Browder, etc. Active trade union participation in all these organizations and activities unites the American people and strengthens the hand of the Government against Hitler. It gives organized labor invaluable political experience. It sets up vital contacts between labor and other anti-Hitler forces. And, by bringing the representatives of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. together in daily cooperation on war issues, it paves the way for eventual organizational unity of the trade union movement.

Our districts are rich in experience of participation in local national unity movements, such as the New York City elections, the big Madison Square Garden meeting for medical aid to the U.S.S.R., the great New York C.I.O.-A. F. of L. anti-Hitler demonstration. Examples could be multiplied. Also we have neglected many splendid opportunities for such work. The comrades in their discussion should tell the National Committee meeting about their experiences, so that our whole Party may profit from them.

As yet, only a start has been made toward activizing the trade union movement within the national unity. In every field of anti-Hitler activity more trade union participation is absolutely necessary. Especially is this so in the fight against the appeasers, both within and without the ranks of the labor movement. The trade unions should support such organizations as the Fight for Freedom Committee and the American Committee to Aid British Labor. They should fight the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appeasers on all fronts. William Green, at the A. F. of L. convention, exhibited a dangerous complacency when he said "There are no isolationists in the A. F. of L.," while at his elbow sat W. L. Hutcheson, First Vice-President of the A. F. of L., who is openly affiliated to the America First Committee, and while Coughlinites and others continue to exercise a dangerous influence in many A. F. of L. unions. The C.I.O., at its convention, did good work by attacking Charles Lindbergh and denouncing the F.B.I. as a Gestapo; but when it withheld condemnation of the America First Committee by name, this was a dangerous concession to John L. Lewis. The trade unions must be in the forefront of the fight against the America First Committee, which is Hitler's fifth column. Above all, it must clean its own leadership of this appeaser poison. The whole labor movement must ring with the struggle against such pro-Hitler organizations as the Dies Committee, the F.B.I. and the America First Committee.

For a Strong Anti-Hitler Foreign Policy

If the Government is to carry on a militant policy of struggle against Hitler and his allies it must have the active support of the whole trade union movement. One of the great weaknesses in the fight against Hitler to date has been the failure of the leaderships of the two federations to back up strongly the Government in its anti-Hitler foreign policy and to press for still more aggressive action. There has been too much hesitation, too much of a tendency to leave the whole matter to Roosevelt. Passive endorsement of the Government's anti-Hitler line is not enough; there must be a powerful reinforcement of it by the militant mobilization of labor's forces, in the localities and nationally, in every fight that takes place with the appeasers and fifth columnists in the step-by-step working out of the anti-Hitler policy. In the recent struggle to repeal the Neutrality Act, for example, when the isolationists and appeasers showed great activity, instead of thousands of resolutions pouring into Congress from the labor movement supporting repeal, hardly a peep was heard from the labor movement.

However, the two conventions of labor, especially the C.I.O., registered real progress in the question of foreign policy, thereby greatly strengthening the hands of the Government and the fight of the American people. The conventions showed that the whole trade union movement, which is coming to realize more and more that America is deeply endangered by Hitler's aggression, and that "we have a war to win," is rapidly freeing itself from the "No A.E.F." illusion, from the idea that the United States should serve only as "the arsenal of democracy," and from the foolish notion that Hitler can be licked by "measures short of war." Although neither federation advanced to the point of calling for a declaration of war, the A. F. of L. demanded that the government "extend full and complete aid to Great Britain and her allies—until Hitler and his allies are de-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cisively defeated," while the C.I.O., speaking out even more militantly, insisted that "we immediately furnish all possible aid to and completely cooperate with Great Britain, the Soviet Union and China . . . and thereby bring about the military annihilation of Hitler's regime."

In the C.I.O. convention labor and the American people scored a real victory by the overwhelming defeat of John L. Lewis' isolationist foreign policy. By its resounding defeat of Lewis, the convention showed that the C.I.O., like American workers in general, wants nothing to do with such isolationist policies.

The more definite stand of the C.I.O. in support of the Government's anti-Hitler policy laid the basis for united action of the whole labor movement on the question of foreign policy, a condition that did not previously exist. The A. F. of L., however, although it expressly favored extending aid to the U.S.S.R., did not help matters when it slapped the anti-Hitler movement in the face by bitterly denouncing that country and asserting that a military alliance with it was "unthinkable." In spite of this stupid red-baiting, which helps no one but the appeasers, there exists the basis for joint action of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. in support of Roosevelt's policy of struggle against Hitler. It now remains to carry the anti-Hitler resolutions of the two conventions to the great rank and file of the labor movement and to make these resolutions the base for a gigantic united mobilization of all labor's forces, day in and day out, for building national unity and the world coalition against Nazi Germany and its allies.

The Battle for Production

For the world coalition of anti-fascist peoples to succeed in smashing Nazi Germany it is necessary that American arms production be raised to the very maximum. Accordingly, under Government pressure, general production increased 29 per cent from August, 1940, to August, 1941. Experts estimate that by next June from 50 to 65 per cent of all American output will be devoted to defense production. Both the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. conventions, acutely aware of the decisive importance of production in the war against Hitler, pledged every effort to secure the utmost output possible. The C.I.O. resolution on the question struck the keynote—"The essence of our national defense program is one of production—the need of producing the necessary quantity of materials—airplanes, ships and guns—within the shortest period of time."

To fulfill labor's part in the battle for production it is not enough that the trade unions adopt a no-strike policy, nor that they simply look after the economic interests of the workers. They must plunge deeply into the whole economic structure of defense production and help administer it. They must especially be on guard against business-as-usual profiteering employers who subordinate the needs of defense production to their own greed; they must combat the great monopolists

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who, seeking to dominate all industry, are the enemies of plant expansion and the distribution of war contracts to small concerns; they must be very vigilant to expose and combat those powerfully situated appeasers and pro-Hitler elements in industry who are deliberately striving to sabotage defense production and to undermine the whole anti-Hitler policy of the government and the American people.

The two labor conventions recognized the vital need for labor to participate administratively in industry in order to assure successful defense production. They rightly complained that the Government defense agencies are now overloaded with employers and that the trade unions are almost entirely unrepresented, except in the limited Labor Advisory Council of the O.P.M. The conventions demanded full labor representation in all the defense production machinery.

In its Murray Industrial Councils Plan, the C.I.O. convention put forth the most advanced program of labor for playing its proper administrative role in defense production. In substance, the Murray Plan calls for the setting up of councils in each major defense industry, composed of equal representation from labor and the employers, with a Government appointee acting as chairman. The broad scope of these industrial councils is indicated by the following brief quotation from the original statement of the policy:

"The council would have responsibility for the various factors in each industry, now distributed through a vast number of agencies, such as allocation of orders, determination and allocation of expansion needs, scheduling of production rates, determination of priorities, establishment of industrial relations, and labor supply."

Although the A. F. of L. made a somewhat more conservative approach to the production problem, its policy went in the same general direction as the Murray Plan. The A. F. of L. convention, for its part, demanded labor representation on all boards dealing in any way with defense production, and it stated its general policy as follows:

"Full participation of chosen representatives of labor and industry in the defense program and in planning for post-defense adjustments is the effective, democratic method of assuring an all-out effort for national defense."

A few days ago William Green gave this policy more concrete form by his demand that a War Labor Board be set up.

There is an urgent need that the C.I.O., A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhoods meet together and work out a unified policy regarding labor's role in administering defense production. Obviously, with anything like a spirit of unity prevailing between the C.I.O. and A. F. of L., a joint plan for the whole labor movement could be formulated. Such a united labor plan, backed by 11,000,000 trade unionists, would compel government and employer recognition, and it would redound enormously to the advantage of the nation's defense.

It is a major task to popularize

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

far and wide in the trade union movement and among the American people at large the Murray Plan and the demand for more labor representation generally in defense production. At the same time, the Murray Plan, or adaptations of it, should be introduced, so far as possible, in individual localities, industries and plants. The workers in every shop, factory and city should seize the initiative to develop plans for increasing production. The Ford workers give an excellent example of such initiative. Already the trade unions have acquired a great deal of experience in this direction and the delegates to this National Committee meeting should make a review of such local experience a central part of their reports.

For an Equitable Distribution of the War's Burdens

The supreme class interest of the workers, in keeping with the basic national interests of the American people, is the defeat of Hitler. This fundamental common interest—to preserve American national independence and to safeguard the welfare and liberty of our people—demands imperatively that the workers' organizations cooperate with capitalists, farmers, professionals, and other classes and groups in the anti-Hitler national unity. To facilitate the achievement of this national unity it is also necessary that the workers actively defend their immediate economic interests. Healthy, well-fed and well-cared-for workers are vital to national defense.

The workers realize fully that Hitler cannot be licked without the American people making sacrifices; they know that when 50 per cent or more of all our production will eventually go for war purposes we as a people will have to undergo economic hardships. The workers are quite willing to make all necessary sacrifices to beat Hitler, and they are already demonstrating this by the restraint they are using in their trade union actions and demands. But, while willing to set an example of sacrifice, the workers at the same time have to insist that the war burdens should be fairly distributed upon all classes. They cannot bear the whole load themselves.

Obviously the workers must be on the alert to secure a fair distribution of the war burdens. Powerful and reactionary forces are actively at work to slash ruthlessly their living standards, to smash their labor unions, and to undermine all American democracy.

Capitalists practicing business-as-usual methods are utilizing the war emergency to carry on a profiteering orgy. Leon Henderson, Price Administrator, says that for 3,000 leading corporations profits will be up this year 60 per cent over 1940, when they were already 19 per cent above 1939. The cost of living is skyrocketing. In the past year it has advanced at least 15 per cent, and economists are warning that the trend today is pretty much the same as in World War I, when the cost of living doubled in the period from 1916 to 1920. Meanwhile, due to hard-boiled employer resistance, the wages of the workers

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

generally have lagged behind or remained stationary. U. S. Commissioner of Labor Statistics Isador Lubin says that net labor cost has risen but 1.2 per cent since 1936, while net price increases for wholesale products average 20 per cent for all commodities.

The employers, especially the great monopolists, are strongly resisting efforts to curtail their profits, as witness their present fight against real price control and their violent reaction against Secretary Morgenthau's mild proposal to restrict wartime profits to 6 per cent; and the government has not adopted adequate measures to check the rising costs of living and to halt the threatening inflation. Nor have the government boards that are being called upon to consider the workers' demands lent a responsive ear to them. Only recently we have seen the spectacle of two boards—the National Labor Relations Board in the captive mine case, and the President's Emergency Board in the railroad wage demands—having their skimpy decisions justly rejected by the workers and then referred by the Government to new bodies for revision. And now, in the House, we have just seen the adoption of the infamous Smith Bill, which is a menacing threat to the whole labor movement.

The strike weapon is not the answer to the workers' problem of protecting their living standards and unions while fighting for an equitable distribution of the war burdens. For strikes would cut down war munitions production, thereby injuring the workers and the whole nation in their most vital interest, the military defeat of Hitler. The workers are fully aware of the imperative necessity of keeping industry going at full blast. They don't want to strike, and they are doing so only under serious provocation. In fact, the workers are already voluntarily widely refraining from the use of the strike, most of the present-day strikes being of very short duration and mostly of a demonstrative character. The workers are quite ready to accept mediation or arbitration, if they have even half a chance to get a square break.

Strikes in defense industries, besides injuring production, tend to isolate the unions from other masses of the people. The anti-union reactionaries came close to defeating the repeal of the Neutrality Act, with the recent ill-advised coal strike as their excuse, and now labor is having a most serious fight in Congress to prevent the final passage of drastic anti-strike legislation, some of which apparently has the backing of the Roosevelt Administration. In this war emergency labor should contemplate using the strike only when the basic economic needs of the workers are involved or the very life of trade unionism is threatened, and then only after all other means of settlement have been exhausted. Only if the trade unions follow a strong policy or responsibility toward the national defense can they serve as the main safeguards of American democracy and defeat those elements who are aiming at establishing fascism in this country.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is not enough, however, to tell the workers not to strike. They must have effective means to prevent undue war burdens being placed upon them. A considerable part of the answer to this problem is the development of a better brand of trade unionism. Shop grievances must be more systematically taken care of by local committees, and the national trade unions should pay closer attention to local movements of the workers. Active organizing campaigns must also be pushed to strengthen the trade unions generally. These elementary union measures will go far to eliminate hastily called local strikes. In numerous instances lately we have seen strikes which could have been prevented by strong organization and effective negotiations. It is a trade union axiom that powerful unions, well-handled, are far better able than weak ones to secure their demands without striking.

But the fundamental answer to the workers' problem of protecting their economic interests in this war emergency lies, as a necessary phase of the building of national unity, in united political action. The C.I.O., the A. F. of L. and the Railroad Brotherhoods simply must get together politically. They must present a solid front to profiteering employers and union-smashing reactionaries. They must convince the American people that the present attacks upon the workers' standards and trade unions are direct injuries to national unity and the defense program. Only in this manner can they secure full representation in the government and all its defense boards, accomplish the establishment of adequate wages and proper working conditions, achieve legislation to check the soaring cost of living and repulse the attacks of labor-hating reactionaries who are seizing upon the war emergency to hamstring the trade unions and weaken civil liberties generally. Parallel action by the different groups, that is, independent steps more or less along similar lines by the C.I.O. and A. F. of L., is not enough. Only when labor moves in a body can it hope to wield its full and indispensable political influence in this critical situation.

It was one of the greatest weaknesses of the two labor federation conventions that they did not more clearly realize the need for labor unity and intensified political action. This was largely because they were overwhelmed by the antagonisms of their rival union claims in industry. But this grave shortcoming must be overcome. For labor to unite politically in support of its program is absolutely necessary. All *get-together movements* on the part of the C.I.O., A. F. of L. and railroad unions, on a local or industry-wide scale, should be cultivated as steps toward the much-needed immediate goal of a politically united national labor movement.

Other Trade Union Questions Relating to National Unity

The foregoing discussion about national unity, foreign policy, the battle for production and the defense of the workers' economic interests gives the main outlines of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our policy in the main fields of trade unionism. Now for some special aspects:

(a) *Organization of the unorganized:* The work of organizing the unorganized workers should be pushed vigorously. This is necessary in order to strengthen national unity. The stronger the trade unions, the stronger our nation's struggle against Hitler and against reaction in this country. The workers are eager to organize and can readily be brought into the unions in huge numbers. The right of organization must not be surrendered in this war, as it was by Gompers during World War I. Today the right to organize is recognized by Federal law and the workers should insist upon its enforcement.

Organizing campaigns can and should be carried on without strikes. Strikes over jurisdictional questions with rival unions should be prevented by mutual agreements along the lines of the understandings between the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. electrical workers in New York and the steel workers in Gary. Strikes for the collection of union dues should be strictly avoided by the unions and systematic collection work instituted. As for the closed shop, important as this is for union labor, it would nevertheless be a grave mistake to launch wide strike movements for its establishment. With active organization work any live union can establish virtually a closed shop and make its recognition as such by the employers and the Government a secondary question.

Vitally important in the question of organizing the workers and for the unity and health of the trade union movement in general is the avoidance of raids by A. F. of L. and C.I.O. unions upon each other's more or less well-established territories. Such are the A. F. of L.'s raids upon the miners, steel workers, textile workers, aviation workers, etc., and the attempts by Lewis-controlled C.I.O. unions to take over organized building trades workers, teamsters and railroad workers. So far as possible, the aim should be to direct the organizing efforts of the two rival federations to the great masses of unorganized workers. The C.I.O. Council in Detroit gave a splendid example of trade union unity when it publicly condemned the Lewis invasion of the building trades and teamsters unions in that city.

(b) *Trade union democracy:* In this war emergency, as never before, is the time ripe and the necessity great for the maximum democracy in the trade unions. The C.I.O. convention just held was a splendid example in this respect. Before the convention opened the affiliated national unions and industrial councils met widely and expressed freely their ideas on foreign and domestic questions, and when the C.I.O. convention came together it truly reflected this democratic mass expression, to the consternation of the Lewis forces. In a number of C.I.O. unions, however, there are many undemocratic practices which should be eliminated. One of the worst examples is in the United Mine Workers, where John L. Lewis rules autocratically, many of the big district organizations being without

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regularly elected officials and run arbitrarily by Lewis's appointees.

In the A. F. of L. convention and unions the need for more democracy is urgent. Contrast the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. conventions. In the C.I.O. convention the rank-and-file influence was decisive and was reflected in all its proceedings and decisions. In the A. F. of L. convention, however, the hard-boiled bureaucrats reigned supreme; the left and progressive forces were without organization and real influence, and the will of the rank and file was a thing remote. The need for the left and progressive forces in the A. F. of L. to become more active is an acute one and should be given vastly more attention. The A. F. of L. workers are progressive and militant and, were they truly represented in their union leaderships and A. F. of L. conventions, the whole American labor movement would be enormously strengthened.

Especially in the A. F. of L. is it necessary also to carry on a relentless struggle against racketeering and gangsterism. Their existence must not be left as an excuse for such reactionaries as Westbrook Pegler to make war against the labor movement. Peglerism has become a real menace to trade unionism and it must be fought resolutely.

At its convention the A. F. of L. again sidestepped the urgent question of racketeering, by its milk-and-water anti-gangster resolution and by its evasion of the Browne issue through reducing the number of Executive Council members. The left and progressive forces should take the lead in this vital matter.

(c) *The Negro Workers:* During the past few years, especially in the C.I.O., the Negro workers have come forward as a powerful trade union force. They played a big part recently in the organization of the Ford plant. Yet in many trade unions of the A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhoods they are still flagrantly discriminated against. In the C.I.O. unions the situation is much better, but even here there still linger many subtle remnants of white chauvinism. The A. F. of L. convention once again evaded the question of justice for the Negro workers. All of which should be a signal for the left and progressive forces to wage an intensified and tireless struggle wholly to eradicate racial prejudice from the ranks of the American labor movement and American industry. This problem is now acute in connection with the defense industries and the achievement of national unity.

(d) *Inter-unio factionalism:* In this period of acute national emergency, when it is necessary to create the broadest national unity possible against Hitler and his American agents, it is especially necessary to work for the cooperation within the trade unions of all who want to fight Hitler. The C.I.O. convention gave a magnificent example of how this united action can be secured. All the elements who favored a militant fight against Hitler, rising above their differences on other questions, created together a working unity that made the C.I.O. convention a landmark in the develop-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment of the American people's struggle against Hitlerism. Were the same spirit to be shown between the top leaders of the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O., the question of the political unity of the American labor movement would be quickly solved.

In solidifying the unions internally in the struggle against Hitlerism, the need to abolish red-baiting has become urgent. In this respect the C.I.O. convention again scored a victory and showed its truly progressive spirit, because its proceedings were entirely free from this reactionary practice. In the A. F. of L. convention, however, as well as in many unions, red-baiting still continues. With the lefts and progressives following diligently the policy of working wholeheartedly with all elements in the trade unions who want to fight Hitler, real progress can quickly be achieved in ridding the labor movement of the disease of red-baiting, or at least in greatly reducing its virulence.

(e) *International Trade Union Unity*: In these days of war it is most important that labor develop strong ties internationally. This is necessary in order that the struggle against Hitler may be prosecuted vigorously. It is especially necessary, therefore, that the American labor movement link itself up officially with the newly organized Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee. That neither the A. F. of L. nor the C.I.O. conventions took steps in this direction was a real weakness.

Then there is the question of the solidarity of labor in the Western Hemisphere. The broad path to secure this is for both the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. to establish official cooperation with the Latin American Confederation of Labor, which combines all the bona fide trade union movements in the countries south of the Rio Grande, and which a week ago concluded its fine convention in Mexico City. By attempting to revive the moribund Pan-American Federation of Labor and trying to force it upon the Latin American workers, the A. F. of L. leaders are doing a disservice both to the solidarity of the all-American labor movement and to the building of the Western Hemisphere anti-Hitler front.

In the report of Comrade Minor, as well as my own, it has stood out that organized labor is playing a larger and more militant part in the national unity against Hitler and his allies. It is also obvious that we Communists have been no small factor in this advance of labor. We have helped explain the true significance of the war and the need of America to play its full part in it; we have stressed the vital necessity of national unity; we have done what we could to stimulate munitions production; we have actively supported the C.I.O. big organizing campaigns; we have defended the people's civil liberties and fought for the equitable distribution of the war's burdens.

Our line is sound and in the main it has been well applied. Such shortcomings as have occurred have tended generally in the direction of sectarian narrowness, which is the main danger against which we have

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be on guard. Among our greatest shortcomings in the present period are: a serious underestimation of the importance of the A. F. of L., failure to take advantage of favorable opportunities to develop national unity movements, especially with non-working class elements; slowness in developing cooperation with other elements in the unions willing to fight Hitler; hesitancy in raising strongly the need for united action between the C.I.O., A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhoods on all defense questions; and inadequate support of the Free Browder campaign in the trade unions.

We should explain these and our other weaknesses and lay the basis for their correction at this National Committee meeting. And when we return to our various districts we should attack with redoubled vigor the many tasks in building the national anti-Hitler unity, as outlined in the reports of Comrade Minor and others. Briefly, these tasks may be thus summarized: to arouse the American people fully to the danger to our national independence presented by Nazi Germany's aggression and the fundamental necessity for our nation to join completely with Great Britain, the U.S.S.R. and China for the military destruction of Hitler and his puppets; to utilize every means for the building of American national unity in support of the Government's anti-Hitler policy, in winning the battle for production, in smashing such treasonous fifth columnists as the America First Committee; to struggle for an equitable distribution of the burdens of the war and while doing so to protect the living standards, trade unions, and civil liberties of the people from attacks by profiteers and fascist-minded union haters. Let us redouble our efforts for the release of our leader, Comrade Earl Browder. And as we do our share in all these basic tasks let us never forget that the master key to labor's playing its full part in every phase of the fight against Hitler is united action between the C.I.O., the A. F. of L. and the Railroad Brotherhoods. And let us keep constantly in mind the basic need to build the fundamental instrument of all our work, the Communist Party.

Let me say, finally, that the American trade union movement, both big sections of it, the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L., is on the march forward. It is strengthening its numbers, unifying its forces, clarifying its understanding, improving its leadership. More and more it is playing its fundamentally necessary role in the development of the national unity of our people and in its fight, jointly with the U.S.S.R., Britain and China, to annihilate Hitler and Hitlerism. Nor can all the reactionaries—with their Smith Bills, their Dies Committees, and their organized sabotage of national defense—halt the progress of the American labor movement and the development of the American people's struggle against Hitlerism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT WE CAN LEARN FROM THE SOVIET PEOPLE

By ISRAEL AMTER

THE whole world stands in admiration of the people of the Soviet Union and their glorious Red Army. The acts of heroism of the Red Army, Navy and Air Fleet have warmed the hearts of the peoples fighting against the Axis powers, and have caused consternation in the armies of Hitler, Mussolini and Hirohito. Even that staid body, the United States Congress, broke out in hearty enthusiastic applause when, in speaking before the assembled United States Senators and Representatives, Winston Churchill paid tribute to the courage and heroism of the Soviet people.

The Red Army is now in the midst of a developing counter-offensive against Hitler. This is taking place along the whole vast front, after a period of organized retreat, the loss of several important cities, and imminent threats to Moscow and Leningrad.

When Hitler declared war on June 22, he had a decided military advantage. His armies were mobilized and he knew when and where he would strike. He took the offensive which, after months of bloody struggle and terrific losses by Germany and her allies, brought the Nazi army within twenty miles of Moscow. Hitler had been accustomed to conduct his war in Blitzkrieg fashion and he therefore calculated on being in Moscow in several weeks. When that did not materialize, he promised that his army would parade on the Red Square on November 7. He bragged about the losses inflicted on the Red Army and ridiculed the statements of the Soviet Government as to his colossal losses.

Hitler did not enter Moscow on November 7. Instead, the Red Army paraded on Red Square and Stalin addressed them, stirring them on to ever more heroic deeds. Hitler's armies have been thrown into wild retreat, forced to abandon their guns, rifles and tanks. New, well-equipped Red Army divisions have been brought to the front and, assisted by the wintry weather, have inflicted terrible losses on the Nazi forces. (The utilization of weather is a decided element in military strategy, but does not explain Hitler's rout in the milder land of the Crimea.) The Nazi army is still very powerful—no one

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should underestimate its strength. But demoralization is developing on certain sectors of the Nazi front, which has led to the removal of high-ranking German generals, such as Von Brauchitsch.

Hitler miscalculated. He did not know the strength, equipment and mobility of the Red Army, and he disregarded certain facts that Stalin has pointed out in his address of November 6: First that "The morale of our army is higher than that of the German"; and secondly, "The Germany army is getting far away from the German rear, is compelled to act in hostile surroundings, is compelled to create a new rear in a foreign country."*

Hitler had hoped that antagonisms would arise between the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union; that national group could be set against national group; that fifth column agents could still be gotten to undermine the Red Army from within; and that, particularly in the Ukraine, a movement could be generated in favor of separation from the Soviet Union, which would cause a crack in Soviet unity. He had his Ukrainian hetmans, such as General Skoropodski, prepared to take over the leadership of the Ukrainian people. But all these insane speculations were destroyed by the indestructible unity and fighting strength of the Red Army, backed by the whole united people of the Soviet Union.

This moral and political unity of the Soviet people, rooted in the conditions of their socialist democracy, is animated by a clear understanding of the issues in this war.

The Soviet people know that their war against the invader Hitler is a just war, a life-and-death struggle against world fascism. They know that victory is possible only by subordinating everything and adjusting all phases of life and activity to the needs of the war; that it is a people's war, for the prosecution of which the whole people, men, women and children, must be mobilized. This requires the proper utilization of the military and material resources as well as the application of a correct military policy, which have been carried out in brilliant manner, astounding the best military strategists of the non-Soviet world.

* * *

Lenin taught us that there are several principles involved in winning and activizing the people. There must be correct policy; this policy must be taken to the masses and made the driving force among them; on the basis of a clear understanding of this policy, the greatest popular initiative must be unleashed; and finally, criticism and self-criticism are required, to correct mistakes and realize the policy in its broadest form through the personnel involved.

The policy of the Soviet Union has been correct. For many years—also through the period of the League of Nations—the Soviet government struggled to have adopted and put into action the idea of col-

* *Stalin Speaks to the World*, Workers Library Publishers, p. 6.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lective security. The Western Powers, however, rejected the policy of collective security, as Winston Churchill recently admitted. But finally the great anti-Axis coalition —the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union and China—today leads the democratic peoples of the world—those subjugated and those threatened by Hitler—in the fight for victory over fascism. This Union of Nations has been accomplished at the cost of terrific desolation, destruction and loss of human life, and could have been avoided, had the proposals of the Soviet government been adopted in time.

Soviet policy correctly recognized that, while strengthening the socialist state and improving the conditions of the people, it was necessary to build up and constantly reinforce the key defense industries, in order to meet the increasing dangers from abroad. The policy followed by the Soviet government enabled the country to meet the attack by Hitler in a manner that astonished the world.

Meeting the needs of modern warfare, the Soviet government adopted a *single war production program,* whose supreme object is the winning of the war. The whole economic establishment — factories, mines and farms—works on one program coordinated to meet the needs of the war. This insures proper production of the proper materials at the proper time, coordinated by the government and meeting the needs of the front and rear.

The adoption of such a unified war program is, of course, enormously facilitated in the Soviet Union by the existence of a planned socialist economy. The carrying through of this war program is made possible through the fullest democratic mobilization of the entire people. The program is seized upon by the people, who are profoundly convinced of its correctness and are equipped with the political and technical education necessary to fulfil it.

The Soviet Union is made up of many nationalities whose unity has been welded. Today they fight together as one people. The old weapon of the tsars and reactionaries, namely, anti-Semitism, which is one of the chief weapons in the arsenal of fascism, is branded as a crime in the Soviet Union. The powerful trade unions, representing 25,000,000 workers and employees, have one common interest—common to themselves and the whole Soviet people. They are serving to rally the soldiers at the front, the workers' guards in the cities, the workers in the factories and on the farms, into one solid army fighting for their freedom and independence.

In every sphere of defense activity the best example has been given by the Communists, who in clarity of understanding, daring, courage and self-sacrifice, have been models for the rest of the people. The process of educating the people is a daily one, taking place at the front, in the trenches and dugouts, in the factories and mines, on the farms, in the schools and colleges. This gives every Soviet citizen an understanding, not only of the general perspective of the war, but also of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

daily events, so that depression at no time can enter their minds. On the contrary, during the days of retreat, the facts of the situation only stimulated them to greater endeavor, to greater deeds of heroism, to more production and aid to the fighting army.

The greatest initiative has been developed. During the early days of the Soviet Republic, when the destruction of the imperialist world war and the allied invasion had to be overcome, shock brigades took their place at the most dangerous places, as well as in production, to steel the determination of the people and to heighten the morale of the fighting army and of the whole people. The development of the Stakhanovite movement, embracing hundreds of thousands of workers and peasants, revealed tremendous initiative in the finding of new methods and ideas to facilitate and accelerate production. Today it has reached unparalleled proportions. The needs of the country grow daily. Testimonial to this initiative has been given by outstanding bourgeois observers. Thus, Joseph E. Davies and Averell Harriman have related how Soviet mechanics assembled British and American planes and repaired American tools as rapidly and efficiently as any American or British mechanic could have done; how swamps were drained and landing places built at record speed. Machinery from the United States and England does not carry replacement parts. Engineers and workers have worked forty-eight hours at a time to produce the machinery to turn out these parts, thus ensuring that a maximum of war weapons will be available.

These are some of the bases by which the Soviet Union before the war rose to second place in world production and are evidence of how the Soviet people are equipped and mobilized to carry through the war program.

Over a perid of years, there has developed socialist competition between factory and factory, worker and worker, that has helped to increase production, improve wages, etc.

On the basis of Stalin's address to the nation on July 3, guerrilla and partisan groups have been organized and have carried on heroic work behind the Nazi line, demolishing equipment and destroying huge numbers of the Nazi forces. The story of the guerrillas and partisans is a glorious page in the history of this war.

Vigilance and alertness during wartime are imperative. Social classes have been eliminated in the Soviet Union. Spies and wreckers aiming at destroying industrial plants and transportation, as well as trying to arouse antagonism between groups of the population, have been uncovered and disposed of during the past years. Some had placed themselves in important posts, both in the Government and in the Army, like Rykov, Rakovsky, Tukhachevsky and others, but were apprehended and accorded their deserts.

Wails arose in the capitalist countries that the Red Army was decapitated and would not be able to fight. History has answered these

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"friends" of the Soviet Union. There is no fifth column in the Soviet Union. Complete unity is a fact. Spies and fifth columnists are treated as traitors and executed. Only thus can a nation properly protect itself.

Criticism and self-criticism continue to be expressed in the sharpest form. Only in this manner can sustained creative effort be continued and the best results be obtained. There is always the danger, and particularly in war time, that old routine methods may be persisted in—because they are easier—and bureaucracy develop. This would be disastrous and can be broken down by continuous application of the principle of criticism and self-criticism.

These are some of the facts that account for the brilliant and heroic defense of Moscow and Leningrad by the whole people. Such a people would willingly carry out the scorched earth policy proclaimed by Stalin on July 3. Such people and such a leadership would willingly destroy everything they could not remove, rather than have it fall into the hands of the enemy. The destroyed Dnieprostroi dam is a monument to this heritage. The transport of whole factories eastward beyond the Urals and accompanied by the workers themselves, to be set in operation without delay for the production of war materials, is testimony of what the united Soviet people has accomplished. It is an indicator of the splendid heroism manifested by the 200,000,000 Soviet people.

These are some of the reasons why the great Soviet state—a socialist state—has been able to carry on such a brilliant fight, setting an example for the entire world. These are some of the reasons why the people in the countries occupied by the Nazis look toward the Soviet Union, inspired and encouraged to carry on the struggle for the destruction of Hitlerism and for their own liberation.

The spirit of socialism, which dominates the whole Soviet people, arises out of the knowledge that the land and everything the Soviet people produce belong to the people; that the institutions that they have established through tremendous struggles and difficulties are for the benefit of the whole people; that the democracy the people enjoy is the highest democracy the world has ever experienced, leading to the development of all the potential creative powers of the individual. This makes the love of the people for their socialist state and their land the most powerful force in the world for the destruction of those who aim to oppress the peoples of the Soviet Union and of the world. This makes the Red Army a model of indomitable strength, unwavering, fearless, overcoming all difficulties.

* * *

The people of the United States face the same life-and-death struggle today.

The people of the United States are a courageous, heroic people. The history of our country is studded with deeds of heroism that stir the whole people. One need only mention such names as Nathan Hale

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Crispus Attucks, Samuel Adams, Molly Pitcher, Chaim Solomon, Harriet Tubman, John Brown, Frederick Douglass, Daniel Boone—and a whole galaxy of American heroes of whom our country is proud. In the few weeks since the attack of Japan upon the United States, we have witnessed bold examples of this heroism: Colin Kelly, Jr.; Julius Ellsberry, the Negro messboy on the battleship Arizona; the defense of Wake Island; and the splendid fight of the construction workers of Guam side by side with the marines.

The government program for prosecuting the war is a correct program. President Roosevelt has been the clearest and most advanced force in the Administration to realize the character of the war—its oneness—and the imperative need of a total war effort to defeat the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis. He has been the most insistent upon rallying the whole people for the war effort and has projected the machinery for rousing and mobilizing them.

But there are those in and about the Administration that do not see eye to eye with the President and the people and hold up or retard the fulfillment of this program and, at times, even distort its purpose.

In spite of these deterrent factors, today the people understand that this is a war to crush the onslaught of the Axis powers upon democracy throughout the world, and not, as the appeasers, Thomas "Socialists" and Trotskyites contend, an imperialist war. Our country is waging a just war for its independence.

President Roosevelt has called upon the whole people to unite behind the government. The people are rapidly uniting in recognition of the need of defense of our country. What Roosevelt is endeavoring to achieve, however, is that out of this recognition of the need of the people to wage the war, there be very rapidly developed the active participation of every man, woman and child in the war activities.

The appeasers in Congress, the State Department and other governmental departments are carrying on dangerous work. The State Dapartment took a stand that can serve only to strengthen Vichy with regard to the two French islands, St. Pierre and Miquelon, even after they repudiated Vichy control and asserted their allegiance to the Free French. There is hesitancy about occupying Martinique, the Cape Verde Islands and the Azores, which are outposts for the defense of the Western hemisphere.

Outside Congress, the forces of the "dissolved" America First Committee, the Ku Klux Klan and other fascist and pro-fascist outfits are carrying on diabolical work. Will the government not learn from the experience of France before it is too late? Weaknesses of this kind encourage the appeasers and pro-fascists and make more difficult the overcoming of the attitude of several South American states whose governments have adopted a position of "neutrality" in the present war, thereby enabling the Nazis, fascists and Phalangists to continue their destructive work.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The violent fight of the Soviet Union is an example for the democratic world. Firmness is absolutely essential, on the basis of our correct policy, if the safety of our country is to be insured and the whole nation is to be mobilized for war, not only against our enemies abroad but against the pro-fascist, appeaser elements within our gates.

We are just taking the first steps in mobilizing the people for the war. That the people are ready to support the government is shown by the splendid enlistment in the Army and Navy immediately after December 7, by the response of millions for training in civilian defense, by the response of the national groups and their organizations, and by the purchase of bonds. These are only a few indications of how America will move forward. But it requires more and more education, more and more clarification, so that an awakened people will rally to a man, not only ideologically, but in action, in the struggle for liberty.

The workers have shown a ready response. In the struggle for over-the-top production, the initiative of the workers has been developed to a high degree. True, it has not yet reached the level of the Soviet Union, but it shows that inherent, not only in the workers of our country, but of all countries, is a creative spirit that can be aroused and developed, provided the incentive is given. The Murray Plan for Industrial Councils for each industry; the Reuther plan for converting the automobile industry into a tank and airplane producing industry; the proposals of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union and the Bridges Plan for the shipping industry are a few examples of how the initiative of the workers can be aroused for aiding magnificently in all-out production to serve the men at the front and to supply our allies. The organization of industrial conferences in each industry together with the employers, the working out of speeded up production, show the base upon which the government can rally all forces for the destruction of the Axis powers.

The governments of the United States and Great Britain are capitalist governments based upon private ownership; the Soviet Union is a socialist state: the people control the industries, the farms and all phases of collective life. Hence the U. S. and British governments must deal with certain groups of industrialists who are opposed to the expansion of the war program. The bottleneck in the production of steel, aluminum, copper and lead—the refusal of some monopolists to expand production, and their opposition to government-owned plants for increased production of these basic materials; the opposition of Knudsen and other automobile manufacturers to convert the automobile factories into tank plants (which has resulted in the closing of many plants and the throwing into the streets of 250,000 workers) evidence a reckless and dangerous disregard of the government program and must be treated accordingly if production is to be stepped up.

Certain industrialists wish to con-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fine production within their own hands, thus facing 13,000 small manufacturers with the threat of being driven to the wall. The United States can learn well from the transformation of part of a soap factory in the Soviet Union into production of tank parts. This can be done in the United States with equal facility, provided the opposition of the "business-as-usual" monopolists is overcome—if necessary, by summary decision of the government.

There is the continued opposition of some industrialists to the housing program—the opposition of private construction companies to the government program. There is the growing opposition to government training schools for women and youth, to equip them as quickly as possible for taking their place in industry as more millions of men are called to the colors. The continued drive toward profiteering and the failure of the government to adopt price-control legislation, the opposition to fair taxation of big industries and high incomes, and the unwillingness to accept government orders unless high profits are permitted, are further manifestations of the government's failure to use a firm hand against any and all who would thwart the full mobilization of the people and all resources for the successful prosecution of the war.

The trade unions are playing their part, a splendid part, in production, in civilian defense, and in rallying the people in the all-out fight against the Axis powers. Despite the split in the labor movement, there is growing A. F. of L. and C.I.O. cooperation in the cities, towns and communities behind the war program of President Roosevelt. Around organized labor are being mobilized whole communities and cities. Everywhere they are encouraging the initiative of the workers. The growing cooperation below in the ranks of organized labor is deepened by the example set at the recent conference of labor, industrialists and the government to bring about peace in industry and all-out production. The A.F. of L. and C.I.O. representatives stood together. But the industrialists sought to extort a guarantee against further unionization drives and thus open the way to smashing all trade union organization. United labor, the people and the government must ruthlessly destroy this opposition, unfold the broadest initiative in all phases of work, draw the millions in the shops into creative activity, and thus intensify the development of the just war from an ideological concept to a people's war in action fighting for freedom and independence.

If this war is to be won—and it will be won—the United States will have to adopt a *complete war economy*, subordinating everything to the aim of winning the war. This will mean sacrifices on the part of all. Priorities will have to dominate, but in the United States this does not mean immediate curtailing of production of food, clothing and the everyday necessaries of life. On the contrary, farmers are willing to produce in abundance and are solidly behind the government

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

program. It is not the workers and farmers who have to be won to the war, but some top-notch industrialists and monopolists who either are part of, or flirt with, the appeasers. A complete war economy will require *planning covering all phases of life*. This will require ever greater government control of industry.

Errors can be corrected only if there is serious criticism and self-criticism. First steps in this direction were demonstratively taken by Secretary Knox, who within a few days after the disaster of Pearl Harbor flew to Hawaii to examine on the spot what had occurred. This was followed by an immediate shake-up in the Army personnel. But what was at the root of the situation and who were responsible for it have not been divulged. Active measures against fifth columnists and appeasers must be taken. It was correct on the part of the government to apprehend and jail a certain number of foreign-born in the United States who are engaged in, or suspected of, fifth column activity. But the native fascists continue their work unmolested. They continue their treacherous activities, even though they do not so frequently screech over the radio and in meeting halls. Coughlin persists in his work, utilizing every weakness and vacillation of the government in order to destroy confidence of the people in the federal administration. The appeasers emphasize these weaknesses and the just grievances of the people, in order to undermine the will of the people. They are intensifying anti-Semitic activities, stirring up deeper prejudice against the Negroes, who are demanding that they participate in equal measure and with full rights in the armed forces and in all-out production. Thus the pro-fascists seek to alienate a vital section of our population from the united war effort.

We Communists have pledged fullest cooperation to the national war program, even to the last drop of our blood. Our task is to take the federal program to the people and particularly to the workers, educate them, enlighten them, clear up any doubts and mobilize them for a real people's war. This means that Communists modestly give their all at the front; aid in accelerating all-out production, individually and collectively, by the workers; and actively do their part in civilian defense, the sale of bonds and stamps, and war relief for the peoples of the Allied powers.

Communists have proved their stand against fascism.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is millions strong and there are more millions of young Communists in the Young Communist League of the Soviet Union. Seven million Communists in the armed forces, factories and farms, and leading the government, set an example of understanding, courage, determination, fearlessness and self-sacrifice, and help rally the last man, woman and child in the Soviet Union for the decisive war to destroy Hitlerism.

In China, despite deep-going disagreements with the Kuomintang and even the massacre of tens of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thousands of Communists and their militant followers by the Kuomintang, the Communists, over a period of more than a decade, have been the most far-seeing in the struggle to unite the Chinese people in the national liberation front against the barbarous Japanese imperialist hordes.

In all the countries groaning under the Hitler tyranny—yes, even in the countries of the Axis powers themselves, the Communists are in the forefront carrying on the fight for the destruction of fascism. It is not an accident that those in the Axis-controlled countries who courageously fight against the invaders have been branded as Communists, even though many among them are non-Communist and even opposed to Communism. We Communists accept this title as an indication of the high honor that we enjoy as the staunchest fighters against fascism.

* * *

Our country can learn many things from the Soviet people—things that will be of supreme value for the successful prosecution of the war. No matter what their attitude may have been in the past, more and more people in the United States look with admiration and astonishment at the deeds of military strategy, heroism and devotion performed by the people of the Soviet Union. They are asking what has created this indomitable spirit. What is behind all this? The people want to know. Thus it becomes our task to explain to the broad masses what animates the Soviet people and how we in the United States can apply the lessons in order as speedily as possible to destroy Hitlerism on a world-wide scale.

Our tasks are enormous. No sacrifice can be too great. The American people, side by side with the people of the Soviet Union, Great Britain, China, and all the countries of the two hemispheres harassed and threatened by fascism, unitedly will destroy fascism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN THE NAME OF THE ITALIAN PEOPLE

BY M. ERCOLI

WHEN Napoleon I decided to attack Russia, after having subjugated France and almost all of the Europe of his time to his despotic rule, he went to great lengths to give his enterprise the appearance of a "campaign of all Europe" against the one remaining state on the continent which still resisted his despotism. For this purpose, on the eve of his disastrous campaign which marked the beginning of the collapse of his power, he convoked at Dresden an assembly of the rulers of the vassal states which he had planted on the backs of most of the peoples of Europe.

We are told that there were thirty kings and kinglets, princes and princelings, participating in this assembly—a sorry parade before the breakneck gallop which was to end in the icy waters of the Beresina with the destruction of the remnants of what had been the greatest army that history had ever known.

The sanguinary dictator of fascist Germany, even in this respect, has succeeded only in presenting us with a pitiful parody of the original. In order to baptise his brutal and predatory aggression against the Soviet Union as a "campaign of Europe" he has brought together a collection of vassals who are impressive neither for number nor for quality.

Alongside the Croatian bandit, noted only for engineering the assassination of the Jugoslav king and a French foreign minister, he has collected generals like Antonescu and Pétain, who came to power not through victories and honor but through treason and shame, defeats without battle, and through oppressing their own countries in the service of a foreign power. From this gang of thieves and slaves the dictator of fascist Italy, Mussolini, could hardly be absent—a living symbol of the miserable role which Italian fascism plays in Europe today, symbol of the degradation to which Italy has been reduced by the fascist tyranny.

There does not exist nor has there ever existed any controversial question between the Soviet Union and Italy. Entire pages could be filled with declarations made by Mussolini, on various occasions, concerning the necessity of friendly relations between the two countries. The Soviet Union has never committed any act of hostility against the Italian state. But Mussolini did

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not need pretexts or motives. He received an order from his master in Berlin and slavishly lined up with the other vassals and mercenaries who are asked to help German fascism in its aggression against the last bulwark of liberty and democracy on the continent of Europe, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

This act is the crowning ignominy in the countless proofs that the hateful rule of the fascist blackshirts, under which the Italian people have suffered for eighteen years, is not only the regime of the most bestial reaction, but also an antinational regime acting against the interests of the country and of the people—a rule that is the shame of the Italian people.

I.

The seizure of power by fascism in 1922 was an open act of violence, which canceled constitutional guarantees and destroyed the country's democratic liberties. It was prepared and executed in such a way as to give a part of the population (and a considerable part of international public opinion) the impression that it was directed exclusively against the working class, "to save the country from a social upheaval" which could bring nothing but disaster. The real disaster which the management of public affairs by the fascists has brought to Italy has already exceeded all that the most pessimistic prophets of catastrophe could have foreseen. This is not the place to tell the story of these eighteen years of the personal, uncontrolled, tyrannical power of Mussolini and the gang around him. Nor is it the time to recount the terrible series of outrages, assassinations, acts of terror, and dastardly frauds by which these bandits have succeeded in retaining power, dividing and smashing the people's forces. Today we must denounce the *result* of eighteen years of fascism. This is what must strike home, calling forth the indignation of every man who has the destiny of his country at heart.

We speak not only as representatives of a particular class which has its own interests, its own aspirations, its own ideals; we raise our voices in the name of the people and of the entire country, of this people and this country whose riches have been systematically looted and destroyed, whose most vital interests have been disowned and trampled upon, whose honor and most glorious traditions have been dragged in the mud.

The first liberties, the first organizations that the fascists destroyed were those of the working class, the trade unions above all. It would be, however, a grave error, an absurdity, to pretend, as the fascists have done and still do, in order to deceive public opinion and to justify their crimes, that these unions were created to defend so-called selfish interests, in direct opposition to national interests.

On the contrary, in a country like Italy—in which for centuries the masses, the peasants, the artisans, the workers, exploited by their own reactionary classes and by the brutality of the foreigners who ground Italy under their hated heel, were

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reduced to a level of miserable existence—the trade unions had a profoundly national function. They taught the Italian people something very simple, but something that great numbers of the people did not know yet; they taught them that they had the right *not to go hungry*. If Italy, at the beginning of the present century, had made some forward steps on the road of civilization and progress, if Italian industry had been able to create highly efficient machinery in several of its branches, if the level of agriculture had been raised, this advancement of the country was closely connected with the fact that during this period fundamental strata of the Italian people had begun to earn a living, to subsist like human beings. The vital energy of the entire country was thus vastly increased. The trade unions and other organizations of labor had a decisive function in this progress.

Against these organizations the fascists first directed their fury, destroying with arson and murder all that had been created by an entire people in the best interests of the nation. There were some so blind to all but special class privilege as to applaud this barbarous action. Today, when the Italian people have again been deprived of the right to earn a living, when (according to the evidence of the fascists themselves) the peasants live on herbs, and starvation and semi-starvation are producing epidemics of abhorrent disease in the countryside, the full significance of the crimes committed by the fascists stands out with appalling clarity.

The destruction of the workers' and peasants' liberty and of their mass organizations was only the prelude to the destruction of the freedom, the well-being, the rights, of all citizens, of the entire nation.

After the trade unions and the political parties of the working class came the turn of the Catholics. Their network of peasant organizations and agricultural cooperatives —a noteworthy achievement from the economic and social standpoint —was destroyed by methods characteristic of fascist civilization: by wholesale use of kerosene, dynamite, and the dagger. This, too, was but a beginning. The democrats, the liberals, even the conservative bourgeois, who did not submit to the new despotism of the blackshirts, were hunted in the streets, murdered in their homes, hounded out of all public posts. Everything free, disinterested, honest, clean, in the country, was befouled with mud and with blood. As a logical climax to this wretchedness and shame the sequence of violence and crimes has brought the country to submission to a brutal foreign power that deals with Italy as with a vassal.

The false slogan under which the destruction of the liberty of the Italian people was perpetrated was "the necessity," as the fascists declared, of submitting the entire life of the country, its whole economy, all its riches, to the power of the state, before which all classes, all parties, all particular interests must disappear.

But what is the state under the fascist dictatorship? In whose hands is the control of the economic

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and political life in this state? The new pretenders to the country's leadership came from the dregs of declassed elements, always numerous in a country littered with feudal survivals. They are without faith, without honor, knowing no law other than that of their personal interest—a personal interest understood in the most immediate and lowest sense—the physical destruction of their enemies and personal rivals to secure footholds on the way to riches and supreme power, to loot public and private wealth as they wish. They were educated in the school of violence without risk, against an adversary disarmed and inferior in number, the school of revenge, of falsehood, of betrayal.

The most reactionary elements, the representatives of the most selfish and avaricious classes of Italian society, opened the way to this impudent gang in order to crush all the aspirations of the masses toward well-being and freedom, and to break down all resistance of the workers to misery and oppression. The large land-owners, who impoverished the peasants with semi-feudal methods, enlisted the fascist mercenaries. The leaders of the fascist mercenaries, who have since become the high functionaries and officials of the state, were the docile instruments of the bankers, of the war industrialists, of the plutocrats, of whom they asked no more than to participate in the division of the profits derived from the blood and sweat of the people.

The apparatus of the state and of the fascist party, closely linked together, function with one end in view, that of guaranteeing to several hundred persons unlimited freedom to despoil the coffers of the state and the savings of the citizens for the benefit of private enterprises, unlimited freedom to fleece the people at their pleasure and to stifle protest. After eighteen years of power, these gangsters, who lived on the ragged edges of the penal law in 1922, have become great capitalists, owners of homes, palaces, and immense estates; they are members of the boards of directors of big concerns, which monopolize the country's economy; they have seized control of municipal administration.

The suppression of every kind of public control has been the indispensable premise of corruption unprecedented in the country's history. The example has come from above. The treacherous, disreputable journalist, who twenty years ago was panhandling for subsidies from foreign ambassadors and big industrialists, has become one of the country's greatest capitalists, thanks to his ties with the Ciano family. At exactly the time when, as head of the state, he signed the war pact with Germany, the Mussolini-Ciano family, with a leading position in the steel industry, celebrated a family festival: their fortune had reached a billion lire. The pact with Germany has not been called by the fascists the "steel pact" for nothing.

The successive crises through which Italian economy has passed in the period of the existence of fascist dictatorship have only made more general, more pressing, more blatant the injustice at the base of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the system which fascism has installed and which it defends with violence and terror. "Let the small and average businessmen break their necks"—Mussolini proclaimed. For a country such as Italy, poor in the raw materials which are the basis for large-scale production, this declaration meant the ruin of the country to assure the growing enrichment and despotic power of the ruling oligarchy. The state has intervened on an ever-greater scale, with all the means at its disposal, to hasten this process. Salaries have been cut without notice, by government decree. The peasants have lost the right to dispose of the products of their labor. Entire regions of small and middle-scale farming have been ruined and have lost their population. In the Appennines, once a rich country of fertile terraced slopes, the desert has resumed its sway, advancing as in the decadence of the Roman Empire.

A new name has been bestowed upon this process of ruin. It is called "autarchy"—which means that the country's economy, whose resources are to be entirely mobilized for the war aims of the Rome-Berlin Axis, must be organized in such a way as to be self-sufficient in all fields. This is madness for a country like Italy. The immediate consequence is a continued increase in the cost of production, an enormous expense and waste, that is, a general reduction of the productivity of labor, a dizzy increase in prices and a vertical drop in the living standards of the people. It means, moreover, extermination of the small and middle business man, the ruin of those branches of industry and agriculture that are most adapted to the country's structure and possibilities, and the creation of an enormous apparatus which crushes, stifles, destroys everything, whose only aim is to nourish and develop war industry and furnish profits to its owners. Among these, obviously, the crew of fascist adventurers occupies a place of honor.

As for the people, one of the principal tasks which the fascist press has set itself is that of showing that Italians are gluttons, as a people they eat too much! They must give up *a meal a day* and limit *the other* to the "bare necessities." Cruel irony! The Italians must return to the miserable condition of a hundred years ago, the state of starvation and semi-starvation, so that the fascist clique which is riding on their backs can enlarge its spoils and develop its policy of adventures and violence, of rape and plunder, on an international scale.

II.

In the international sphere after a few years of lamentable pretense, the shrieking contradictions and intrinsic inconsistency of the Italian fascist dictatorship could not but manifest themselves in glaring clarity. The egregious defeats of the Italian army during the last months and, finally, the transformation of Italy into a vassal state of German National-Socialism, are facts whose roots can be found in all that the fascists have done since they have been in power.

The expansionist tendencies and the aspirations for violent conquests which animate the greediest and most reactionary elements of Ital-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ian society have always run up against a fundamental contradiction. On the one hand, the thirst for plunder is particularly exasperated in a class accustomed to living from the exploitation of the masses; on the other hand, there is practically no material base in Italy for a policy of armed conquest, since there is an almost complete absence of basic materials indispensable to the development of modern heavy industry. Mussolini and the fascists proposed to resolve these contradictions in their own special manner. By transforming the Italian people into starvelings without rights, they thought that it would be easy to provide a mental pabulum—particularly for the new generation—in the form of insane jealousy and hatred of other peoples, pictured as richer and happier, and to launch them into a series of war adventures, after fanning chauvinist sentiment and robber mentality to fever heat. . . .

The end toward which Italy is being pushed in this manner can only be a national catastrophe. Precisely because the land is poor, because the national governmental organizations are of recent and weak formation, the Italian people, more than all the other peoples, has its future assured only in a Europe in which collaboration among the nations may be organized on a basis of reciprocal freedom and democracy, excluding all national oppression, all violent conquest. This was understood very well by the most advanced spirits of the time of the Risorgimento, men like Garibaldi and Mazzini, when they proclaimed that the independence and well-being of the Italian people are conditional upon the independence of all peoples. The Italians do not need an empire conquered by violence, but they do need liberty both in their country and on an international scale. In a world subjected to the laws of brutal conquest the Italian people, starved, devitalized, demoralized by eighteen years of inhuman rule, is confronted with just this alternative: defeat or vassalage to one of the bigger brigands.

Mussolini has succeeded in achieving these two results at the same time. He has sent the Italian army to defeat and yoked the country to the Nazi machine.

Mussolini placed war on his program at the very moment when he first attained power. We recall the gale of laughter that swept Europe when, the day after inaugurating himself as head of the state, he compared to Napoleon's marshals his gang leaders, who had covered themselves not with glory, but with infamy, by burning the huts of terrorized peasants and the headquarters of mass organizations which had previously been seized by the police. His foreign policy reaped a harvest of burning humiliations for his regime—as in the case of the famous Corfu exploit and the precipitous retreat at the threat of the English.

He changed his immediate ends repeatedly—but he always had one final, very clearly defined aim, that of hurling Italy into a series of military adventures. Thus, in 1935 Mussolini took advantage of the European situation to attack the Ethiopian people, in the following years to send his army to intervene

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against the Spanish Republic, and in 1939 to occupy Albania. At the beginning of the present war the Italian people were already tired of this sequence of adventures, exhausted by the insane military expenditures (170,000,000,000 lire for the African campaigns alone) and profoundly disgusted with a policy which, as could already be seen, was bringing the country nothing but staggering burdens.

The entry of Mussolini into the war against France and England was the act of a jackal attacking the victim of a crime completed by another, convinced that it was only a question of sinking his teeth into a corpse. But the jackal had already lost many of his teeth, and the enemy—England—was not a corpse at all. Mussolini, in order to maintain the influence of his brigand propaganda, had to foster the opposite illusion. The fascist press, therefore, blared the collapse of the British Empire, announced beforehand triumphant victories for the Italian army, marches on Egypt and on London, the transformation of the entire Mediterranean into an Italian lake. The profits of war industry mounted dizzily and the fascist chieftains strutted in the streets, well-fed and sporting gaudy uniforms and decorations.

The people, for the greater part, remained indifferent, cold, suspicious. The first demonstrations in the country against the war broke out then; for example, a demonstration of students at Genoa, refusing to obey the order to enlist "voluntarily" in the army. Anti-fascist leaflets began again to circulate. The truth is that, on the one hand, the anti-fascist groups understood that the situation compelled them to close their ranks and to take up again their work among the masses, and, on the other hand, profound uneasiness as to the consequences of Mussolini's war policy penetrated almost all strata of the population.

A great part of the bourgeoisie thought: the war against England cannot be a "six-week war," but must be long and destructive. It will mean, in a short time, the end of Italian manufacture and export industry. It will be impossible to import basic materials from overseas, impossible to export. This shuts off, consequently, the prospect that the war can be utilized, as was that of 1914-18, to renew plant equipment and to speed up industrialization. As far as Europe is concerned, after the fall of France, it is entirely incorporated into the German *Lebensraum*.

Italy has even lost the economic positions of secondary importance that she acquired in the Balkans. In order to trade with Belgium, France, Holland, etc., it is necessary to deal through the German authorities occupying these countries. And the Hitlerian minister Funk announces unequivocally that the plan of the conquerors and war provocateurs of Berlin is to submit the whole of Europe, Italy included, to the necessities of the Reich's war economy and of German economy in general. The consequences of the fascist policy can no longer be hidden. Italy, impoverished and exhausted, laden with debts and cruelly oppressed by taxes, faces the prospect of being transformed into

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an economic appendage and a vassal of the Hitlerian Empire.

It must be said that this fact was understood, although perhaps in a confused manner as yet, by the great majority of the population after the first months of war. This explains why the active fascists, in spite of the bare-faced chauvinist propaganda, and the intensified persecution and terrorism, found themselves isolated, in the midst of public opinion which was sometimes openly defeatist and, in general, was hostile to them. Mussolini's personal prestige, maintained artificially by theatrical propaganda, collapsed. Resistance to Mussolini's war policy took the most diverse and even paradoxical forms.

We heard once more of a monarchist opposition, a Catholic opposition, of "anti-fascism" among the army leaders, and so on. Among the people and the soldiers discontent expressed itself in a much more simple and direct manner: in open struggle, actually direct attacks, against the fascist militia. It was impossible to carry on the war when two armies, one made up of the masses of people, and the other made up of the blackshirts (the latter privileged in all respects), were hostile to each other. It might end in civil war. Mussolini decided to handle the situation by taking the militia apart without destroying it, that is, dividing it up and sending small contingents into battalions, in all divisions of the regular army. This brought the struggle against the hated mercenaries into the midst of every military unit.

On the Alpine front the Black Shirts received the first machine-gun fire of the Italian Alpine troops. The Giulia Division—the one that Mussolini stupidly condemned to massacre on the mountains of the Pindus—before being sent to the Greek front, went on a spontaneous strike. The soldiers left their barracks and quartered themselves in the village for two days, refusing to move until all the Black Shirts were expelled from their ranks. In all the barracks, in the military encampments, in all the stations, in the streets of many cities, soldiers and militiamen came to armed clash. A considerable number of officers, even among the higher ones, sympathized with the soldiers, supported them, encouraged them in this struggle.

In this situation, Mussolini needed, at any cost, military successes to raise his prestige again. The laurels received by the traitorous fifth columnists of France and of other countries from their master at Berlin did not let him sleep. But the senile paunch and adipose neck of a Roman emperor of the decadent period are not all it takes to be a thunderbolt of war. With the country seething with unrest and defeatism, the people unable to understand why they should be sent to death, the army undermined by political discord, poorly armed and directed by generals who acquired their stripes among the thieves sitting in the Boards of Directors of the war industry, defeat for the Italian forces was inevitable. In a few weeks, fascism succeeded in sending more than half its war fleet to the bottom of the sea, in destroying an army of 200,000 men in Lybia, losing an expeditionary force

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of 150,000 men in Ethiopia, and meeting a crushing defeat on the Grecian front at the hands of a small army heroically defending its native land. . . .

The military defeats on all fronts have decided Mussolini's fate. Hitler's mechanized forces, saving the positions of the remainder of the Italian army in Lybia, and extending the war to all the Balkan countries so as to break the resistance of the Greeks, temporarily rescued the fascist regime from the profound crisis which was about to arise and which would have swept it away. But Mussolini can continue to govern the country only as "Gauleiter," through Germany's grace and Hitler's will. Hitler went so far as to permit an off-shoot of the Italian royal family to instal himself on the puppet throne of the brigand Pavelitch's Croatia. To keep the yoke of Hitlerian oppression on the necks of the Balkan peoples, German fascism needs gendarmes and turnkeys. If the King of Italy cannot find a less shameful occupation for his descendants, it is just too bad. But the Italian people do not know what to make of this business, which is not to their interest nor their credit. Italy's popular national hero, Garibaldi, taught the Italians to fight and to die selflessly for the freedom of all people, and not to be the mercenaries of a foreign tyrant. . . .

We do not intend to record here once more all the promises that fascism made to the workers, the farmers, the youth and how it failed to fulfill them. One fact dominates all others today: the fact that Italy had been thrown into the plight of a vassal state, that her sons, her resources, her riches, her products, are placed at the disposal of a foreign power to continue its enterprise of conquest, which not only is not to the interests of the Italian people but is directly opposed to their interests. That is what the workers think today when they are torn from their homes to be sent like beasts to forced labor in German workshops under the rain of bombs from the English planes. That is what the peasants think, knowing that their produce, taken from them by force, leaves every day by train loads for Germany. That is what every Italian thinks, everyone who is concerned for Italy's fate, when he sees the control, the pressure, the hated iron boot of the arrogant German, insolent and greedy, grinding down ever more heavily on the country's life.

The regime, and the men who dared present themselves, twenty years ago, as the defenders of the rights of the Italian nation unfairly discriminated against by the great imperialist powers, are directly responsible for this national disaster. If Italy's life and future are to be saved, the country must be freed from this regime and these men. The moment has come for men of all political tendencies and social origins—provided that they are animated by a burning hatred of slavery, by a desire to restore to the people their freedom and well-being, by the firm will to break the vassaldom to German Nazism—to unite their forces and take up the fight.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

III.

What is the job which Mussolini wants to give to Italian soldiers in the criminal aggression against the Soviet Union? That of mercenaries devoid of honor and dignity.

Napoleon also had Italians in the "grand army" with which he invaded Russia. Between the subjects of the French kingdom of Italy and Murat's Neapolitans there were nearly 40,000. History relates that only 330 returned to their homes, including cripples and invalids. The others strewed the Borodin plain, the Maloyaroslavets road and the icy banks of the Beresina with their bones. But at least there were among them some men who still cherished the illusion that if they would fight under Napoleon's banner it would be possible later to induce the Emperor to unite Italy's scattered members into one political body. Today no such illusion is possible.

Every new act of brigandage committed by Hitler can only mean stronger pressure by the Germans to wrest from Italy all that can aid in feeding Hitlerism's war machine —men for the slaughter and for the mines, basic materials and foodstuffs. In 1848, the Germans who held Italy subject had come to the point of stealing the miserable tallow candles with which the peasants lighted their stables. It is said that they used them to season their soup. Today the German commissariat works in a more scientific manner, but the spirit is the same....

The Italian interest is clearly traced. The new criminal Hitlerian adventure must end with the defeat and collapse of German National-Socialism. The army and the people of the Soviet Union must triumph. Hitler must be crushed forever, that the Italian people may finally be free again, masters of their own destiny and their own country, free from the tyranny of the blackshirt henchmen of the masters of Berlin—so that Italy may be saved from imminent catastrophe.

The duty of the Italian people is clear—to help attain this end with all their forces and all their means. The duty of the Italian soldiers is clear. Italy's national enemy is not the Russian people, but German Nazism. The army must revolt against the Germans, against the German agents within its ranks. The duty of the Italian workers is clear—not one gun, not one projectile, not one war instrument that can be used against the Soviet people.

The struggle of the Italian people in defense of the Soviet Union against foreign intervention in 1919-20 was one of the most inspiring pages of the history of that period. There does not exist one category of workers, not one city or village, that did not take part in this struggle. It included a forty-eight-hour general strike, a ministry overthrown by the people's anger, innumerable stoppages and local demonstrations, munitions trains halted, ships blockaded in their ports, interruptions, sabotage in the manufacture of arms and munitions. The traditions of this struggle live on in the best elements of the Italian working class. But this time the question is posed in a still more urgent and immediate manner than

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

before, because the fate of Italy depends much more directly on the struggle which the people of the Soviet Union are waging to repulse fascist aggression and to break the back of Hitlerism. "Struggle or death"—thus the problem is stated today for the workers, for the peasants, for the artisans, for the small and middle industrialists, for men of all social conditions and of all political tendencies, for all who love their country and are concerned with its future.

It is true that eighteen years of fascist dictatorship have greatly diminished the fighting force of the proletariat and of the Italian people. But at the same time we must not forget that resentment and hatred toward the blackshirt regime smolder in all social classes. The great majority of Italians have accounts to settle with fascism. They have not yet avenged the leaders of the workers' organizations, those who were assassinated in their beds, at night, those who were bound by their feet to the blackshirts' cars and dragged through the streets until their heads were reduced to a bloody pulp. They have not avenged the hundreds and thousands of homes burned, sacked, destroyed; the peasants driven from the land, the workers made slaves in the workshops. They have not yet avenged the tens of thousands of soldiers whom fascism sent to be slaughtered in African deserts, in Spain, in Albania; the thousands and thousands of sailors who found their tomb in the Mediterranean Sea. They have not yet avenged the honor of their country, spattered with mud and soaked with blood. The moment has come when the Italian people must remember it all, when they must settle accounts.

It is true, eighteen years of fascist dictatorship have divided the people's forces, have disorientated them. But it should not be forgotten that at stake are the immediate vital and daily interests of the whole Italian people. It is a question of the right of the workers to work and bread, and freedom in their own land; it is a question of the right of the peasant to be master of his field, of his cow, of his grain; of the right of the producers to run their enterprises without having the law laid down for them by a foreign power or its Italian agent. It is a question of every Italian's right to think and to believe that which his convictions, his traditions, tell him and not what the Hitlerian barbarians, those declared enemies of all that is culture, civilization, free creation of the people and of the human spirit, force upon him. For Italy, it is a question of being a free country, respected, industrious, and prosperous, and not a country of slaves, of mercenaries, of ravenous brigands.

The Italian people must and will take the place that awaits them at the side of the Soviet Union, in the front of the peoples who are rising against fascist tyranny and fighting for their own freedom.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEW

BY OAKLEY JOHNSON

THE SOVIETS EXPECTED IT, by Anna Louise Strong. Dial Press: New York, 1941. Paper cover edition. 50c.

ANNA LOUISE STRONG's new book, *The Soviets Expected It*, is a most adequate popular study of the background and opening stages of the epic struggle of the Soviet Union against the Nazi onslaught. It is a vivid, clear interpretation of the events and forces that led to the forming of the world front against Hitlerite Germany, and can be an invaluable weapon for understanding and participating in the new stage of the struggle, that of our own involvement, at the side of the Soviet Union, in the war against the Axis.

Up to the present, no complete and rounded-out summarizing of Soviet international relationhips from August, 1939, to date has been presented to the American public. Miss Strong's book fills this gap. Her effective handling of such widely misrepresented topics as the Soviet - German Non - Aggression Pact, the Red Army march into Western White Russia and Western Ukraine, and the Soviet-Finnish War are doubly welcome today. In breadth of appeal, and in timeliness, this new book may fairly be said to approach the well-known *Soviet Power* of the Dean of Canterbury.

* * *

Miss Strong deals with the Soviet Government's watchful and highly successful foreign policy, its foreseeing of the Second World War and the measures it took to prepare against it. At the same time she gives a good brief account of the industrial, cultural and military progress of the Soviet Union in the twenty-four years since the October Revolution. She shows how the Soviet Government got rid of its fifth column, thereby vastly strengthening the country's powers of resistance. She gives an informative account of the Red Army, its origin, composition, activities and relation to the civil population. Finally, she deals with the personality of Joseph Stalin as well as with his role in the building up and guiding of the socialist state, his part in making the U.S.S.R. the most powerful bulwark of the democratic forces in a world threatened with fascist enslavement.

That the "Soviets expected" sooner or later to face just such an

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attack as Hitler made last June is evident from the historical statements of Soviet leaders, and particularly from the earliest Bolshevik insistence on building up a powerful industry for the country's defense.

"War is implacable," said Lenin, as quoted in this book. "It puts the question with merciless sharpness. Either perish or overtake the advanced countries and surpass them."

And Stalin said, in launching the First Five-Year Plan:

"We could not refrain from whipping up a country which was a hundred years behind and which, owing to its backwardness, was faced with mortal danger. . . . We would have been unarmed in the midst of a capitalist environment which is armed with modern technique."

Important, therefore, is Miss Strong's account of the remarkable achievements of the great Five-Year Plans which began in 1927. By the end of the Second Five-Year Plan in 1937, Soviet industry, she says, "lacked the smooth sureness of the older industrial countries, but its output was 17 per cent above that of Germany. Production per capita was considerably below that of Western Europe, which means that the standard of living was low. But because of the size of the country, production in absolute figures was colossal. *This is what counts in war.*" (My emphasis—O.J.)

There is an indication here why Reichsfuehrer Hitler was so surprised by the quantity and character of military equipment which the Soviet forces were able to mobilize against him.

Socialist planning included not only the building of heavy industry but the proper distribution of industrial plants, as Miss Strong reveals in a fascinating chapter, "Beyond the Urals." One need quote only one significant sentence: "In the past fifteen years the vast geography of Russia has been consciously organized for the plan of total defense." It was in the busy factories "beyond the Urals" that a decisive contribution was made to the blow that sent Hitler staggering back home from in front of Moscow.

Herein lies one of the main sources of the Red Army's strength: mechanized might, backed by a flexible, well-coordinated socialist industry. Another source of Red Army strength lies in its close ties with the people, as the author shows. Not only is the Red Army the "central, specialized core of an armed people," but the Army and the civilian population are accustomed to cooperate with each other in all spheres of activity. It is not surprising that civilians help dig trenches for the Army, when the Army for years has helped in harvesting the crops. Besides, Soviet civilians have long prepared directly for the defense of their homes and country. Every collective farm, the author says, has its Osoaviakhim or Prepared-for-Labor-and-Defense group, "which has learned sharpshooting and has its own weapons: it is a guerrilla band practically formed."

Soviet suspicions of Nazi Ger-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many became certainty during the trials of the Trotskyite traitors. As Miss Strong says, "the hand of Nazi Germany was several times exposed" in these trials. The exposure and punishment of these pro-Nazi traitors had the double advantage for the Soviet Union of smashing the fifth column that Hitler had built up on Soviet soil and of identifying unmistakably the enemy that the Soviet Union would one day have to fight to a finish. As one looks back over the trial testimony, the names of Rudolph Hess and Heinrich Himmler, appearing again and again, read like prophecy. Certainly the malicious and calculated assertions of many American newspaper editors have been exploded, and it is becoming clear to all that the Soviet Government simply acted more intelligently than other countries when it moved ahead of time against those who served the fascist enemy.

Miss Strong takes up the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact under the forceful title "The Pact That Blocked Hitler." She views the subject from the standpoint of what it did, directly and indirectly, to bring about Hitler's eventual defeat. The resulting presentation of the evidence will startle even many who never wavered in their support of the Soviet Union. For those who accepted the pact as a "necessary evil" and that's all, Miss Strong shows it for the military necessity and bold master stroke that it was.

The author gives the lie to the slander that the Non-Aggression Pact was an "alliance." At the very start, the Soviet Government used the occasion of the pact to strengthen its borders against the time when Hitler should strike. "Through it," the author says, "the Soviets obtained far stronger outposts in the Baltic than they had even ventured to suggest to Chamberlain." And it was in the Baltic area, it must be borne in mind, that Leningrad was most exposed to attack.

The marching of the Red Army into Bessarabia "worried Hitler so much that he drew back from the contemplated invasion of Britain and decided to consolidate the Balkans first." Then came the open "Soviet censure of the Bulgarian government for capitulating to Hitler; the Soviet non-aggression pact with Yugoslavia; the endorsement of the Soviet press of Greek and Yugoslav military resistance; the Soviet statement to Turkey that any act of resistance to German passage of troops would be 'sympathetically understood' by the U.S.S.R." Furthermore, as recently disclosed by the Nazi leaders themselves, the Soviet Government protested to Germany against the sending of troops into Bulgaria, and even "proposed an alliance to Bulgaria, which the pro-Nazi Bulgarian government refused."

Miss Strong concludes that "the U.S.S.R.'s lone neutral hand blocked Hitler's immediate plans for expansion more than did the combination of Hitler's open foes. Hitler therefore turned and struck at the Soviet Union in the mightiest assault of human history."

Miss Strong succeeds in making the Soviet picture vivid for American readers by drawing parallels

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

between Soviet and American life and politics. In one or two places, however, this praiseworthy intention results in formulations, that, in the opinion of this reviewer, do not fully preserve the standard of accuracy of the book.

Despite minor flaws of that nature the book as a whole provides in popular form a marshalling of useful material, a lively and convincing view of the background of the current Red Army victories.

The Soviets Expected It is undoubtedly Miss Strong's best book. As a political mass need of the hour, especially for English-speaking peoples in both hemispheres, the wide distribution of Miss Strong's book is at this moment most urgent. It should be recommended and discussed at the meetings of every labor union and of every defense group in the country; it should be made available to every active defender of America.

THE THIRTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF *NEW MASSES*

AN APPRECIATION

IN THE life-and-death struggle against the fascist Axis, to which our nation is irrevocably committed, the labor and progressive press bears a most weighty responsibility. Its contribution to the achievement of victory must be the diffusion of the utmost clarity regarding all questions connected with the successful waging of the war, and the creation of the maximum of conscious, organized, active unity within the nation. Clarity regarding the full significance of the program of the United Nations aligned against Hitlerism; clarity on the question of achieving total war production, and labor's part therein; clarity in regard to national unity, and the defeat of its enemies at home, the appeasers and defeatists (too many have forgotten the lesson of France—how a Pétain endorsed the war effort in order to betray it); on all these questions, and innumerable others, the broadest enlightenment is urgently required. The building of effective national unity demands that the influence of the sowers of doubt, delay, disunity and confusion be set at nought. Too large a part of the press—for national safety—is in the hands of foes of unity: papers like the *Daily News* or Chicago *Tribune*, disrupters of harmony in the war effort, yet read by millions.

For all of these reasons the journals that have proven themselves in the past as honest and reliable de-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fenders of the people's interests need to become more powerful, reach far greater numbers, in order to make their constructive contribution felt, in more strongly mobilizing the millions for victory.

One of the best and bravest of such organs is the *New Masses,* which is celebrating its thirty-first birthday by initiating a drive to increase the number of its readers. This publication has a record to be proud of, a record deeply implanted in three decades of American tradition. Utilizing the weapon of Marxist analysis, the *New Masses* has been able to gauge correctly the historic course of events, at a time when most journals were dizzied by their speed, complexity and suddenness. Long prior to September, 1939, the magazine warned its readers against the Chamberlain appeasement policy, inveighed against every manifestation of it, helped prepare them for the ultimate outcome. One is favorably struck by the rapidity and soundness with which it has reacted to the major developments of the recent period. In years during which the locomotive of history has taken more than one sharp turn, and at full speed, the *New Masses* has not faltered. It has helped thousands to find their bearings.

Today, the *New Masses* is playing its part in the defense of the nation, helping to draw ever larger numbers into active, enlightened participation in the manifold war services, and constructively pointing the way to the fulfillment of the all-out war program.

The *New Masses* occupies a unique position in the scene of American journalism. Its readers constitute an influential section of the American people, including leading figures in many communities: the most politically conscious and active trade unionists, professionals, white-collar workers, journalists, social workers, writers, artists, cultural workers. More than any other publication, it is in a position to bring the advanced sections of professionals closer to the forces of the organized labor movement: a task of urgent importance for the effective unity of the nation. The influence of the magazine is not to be measured by its circulation alone, for its readers in turn disseminate its ideas and information to additional thousands of their associates; while its cartoons are reprinted in many a shop and trade union paper, and its book reviews influence many a writer. A valiant fighter and leader in the camp of progress, the *New Masses* in this present hour of crisis of our national existence can play an even more valuable part than it has done in the past.

And as it does, it will find ever greater numbers of faithful readers who will push its circulation to the maximum.

One may greet the *New Masses* upon its thirty-first birthday and wish it many more years of achievement. It is a strong weapon of democracy: let it be brandished by all honest men who seek to fight through to victory over Hitlerism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW "INTERNATIONAL" PAMPHLETS

Japan Wars on the U.S.A., by Grace Hutchins . . . **$.03**

A study of the background of Japan's unprovoked attack on the U.S.A.

Japanese Imperialism Exposed: The Secret Tanaka Document .10

Japan's program of imperialist expansion and conquest.

William Sylvis and the National Labor Union,
by Charlotte Todes . . . . . **.25**

A study of the first national organization of labor, and its founder.

Work Under Capitalism and Socialism, by A. Leontyev . **.15**

The nature and character of labor under two systems.

Thaddeus Stevens, by Elizabeth Lawson . . . . . **.10**

A study of the great Abolitionist as one of the most advanced democrats of his era.

Thomas Paine: Selections from His Writings 25

A new edition with an introduction by James S. Allen.

The Seven Years' War, by K. Osipov . . . . . **.05**

The capture of Berlin by the Russians in 1760 and its lessons for today.

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To America at War

NEWS FROM THE FIGHTING FRONTS

Exclusive news from Manila and Moscow . . . from London and Libya . . . from the Fighting Fronts . . . News from the occupied countries . . . News of our armed forces in action . . . Military analysis by "A Veteran Commander" . . . Complete coverage of American labor activities . . . First-hand accounts of America's "Battle for Production" . . . An unexcelled Washington Bureau . . .

These are a few reasons why

THE DAILY AND SUNDAY WORKER READER IS BETTER INFORMED THAN THE READER OF ANY OTHER NEWSPAPER IN THE UNITED STATES!

●

DAILY AND SUNDAY WORKER

50 East 13th Street, New York, N. Y.

5¢ ——— At Your Newsstand ——— 5¢

●

Write for free sample copy and subscription rates

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED